



A REFLECTIVE STUDY OF TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHER TRAINING

(APRIL–NOVEMBER, 2004)

FINAL REPORT

April, 2005

A Report prepared for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Office of Regional Sustainable Development, Education and Human Resources Team, by Aguirre International under the Global Evaluation and Monitoring IQC, Contract FAO-I-00-99-00010-00, Task Order 8. Its authors are Ray Chesterfield, Keri Culver, Barbara C. Hunt, and Sylvia Linan-Thompson.

A REFLECTIVE STUDY OF TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHER TRAINING

(APRIL–NOVEMBER, 2004)

FINAL REPORT

DISCLAIMER:

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Reflective Study of sample schools of the Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETT) was conducted under the leadership of Dr. Barbara C. Hunt, consultant with Aguirre International, the GEM Monitoring and Evaluation Contractor for the USAID Latin America and Caribbean Bureau's Office of Education.

In-country research assistance, analysis, and report writing was provided by Penny Ashby, Rose Bradley, Carlos Crespo, Gloria Gamero, Lorena Greñas de Contreras, Dr. Clement Lambert, Dahlia Palmer, Ligia Rodríguez and Dr. Cecilia Thorne. U.S. advice and guidance was provided by Aguirre International consultants, Drs. Sylvia Linan-Thompson, Ray Chesterfield, David Schwarzer and Kjell Enge, and Aguirre International staff, Dr. Roger Rasnake, Associate Director of Operations and Senior Evaluation Specialist, Tom Judy, Senior Evaluation Specialist, and Keri Culver, Evaluation Specialist.

We would like to thank Martin Baptiste, Joan Spencer, and Pat Carter for their assistance in carrying out the preparations and support for the pilot study in the Caribbean. In Central America, we thank Elsa Pineda, José María Ramírez and Lidia Fromm in Honduras, Luz Aronsoht and Isabel García Canelo in Nicaragua, and Maria Ester Ortega and Mirna Mejía in Guatemala for their assistance. In Peru, we thank Raquel Villaseca Zevallos, in Bolivia Eloy Anello and Nadim Ouladi, and in Ecuador Mario Cisneros and Soledad Mena for their extensive preparation and ongoing support. Thanks also to Carleton Corrales, Errol Miller, and Manuel Bello, Regional Directors of the CETTs.

Special thanks go to the USAID Officers, for their support of the study. In the Caribbean, Sonjai Reynolds-Cooper, CCETT Project Manager, assisted in preparations for the pilot; in Honduras, our thanks go to Evelyn Rodríguez-Pérez, Education Development Officer and Mireya Batres-Mejía, Project Management Specialist, for their assistance. In Nicaragua, we thank Antonio Osorio, Education Team Leader, and in Guatemala, Julia Richards, Senior Education Advisor assisted the evaluation team with preparations. Thanks also to Susie Clay, Chief of the Education Office in Peru, along with Fernando Bolaños, Program Management Specialist, for their efforts on behalf of the evaluation.

We are appreciative of the assistance of the CETT staff members and trainers who accompanied us to each school and who gave their time for extensive interviews. We thank the schools that participated in the study and the principals who extended their welcome and hospitality.

Finally, we extend our gratitude and thanks to the classroom teachers, whose unreserved cooperation made this research possible. We wish them and their students much success.

REFLECTIVE STUDY OF TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHER TRAINING 2004 FINAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study found that primary reading teachers in the CETT program have been very successful in improving their skills in the teaching of reading and writing and have achieved a higher level of competency on the various dimensions of literacy instruction studied than teachers from comparison schools who did not participate in the CETT in-service training. CETT teachers were found to be significantly more skilled in teaching phonological awareness; in offering opportunities for oral and written expression, vocabulary development and comprehension; and in employing effective instructional skills.

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the results of a qualitative study of the impact of the Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETT) professional development program for teachers during its first year of implementation. CETT is an outcome of a 2001 Summit of the Americas initiative. USAID provided over \$20 million to establish centers housed at leading universities in Latin America and the Caribbean. Their goal is to improve in-service teachers' ability to teach literacy skills to children in first to third grades in marginalized communities of the LAC Region, to reduce the high rates of illiteracy and school underachievement.

STUDY DESIGN

The conceptual framework underlying the design of the study is that teacher change is a gradual and continual process of behavioral change. This is not an easy task; teachers teach as they were taught, and changing behavior is difficult, often taking years. The change sought requires far more than providing a few new activities or materials to teachers; rather it may require changes in deep-seated beliefs and long-standing habits. Observers in many school improvement projects around the world have noted that there is a continuum of change that can be noted in teachers trying to change from traditional practices to approaches in which children are active participants in their own learning. Four stages of progress towards exemplary literacy teaching are presented in the main body of the report; these stages were used as a basis for the study design.

METHODOLOGY

Including data from the pilot study conducted in the Caribbean, the sample consisted of 114 teachers in 67 schools in eight countries. The study examined 21 dimensions of professional development such as teaching basic reading skills, teaching how to understand text, teaching oral and written expression, effective instruction, classroom management, reflective practice, and parent involvement, plus factors that facilitated or impeded effective implementation. A team of international and local researchers with extensive experience in educational research and evaluation in Latin America conducted the study between April and October 2004.

Effective literacy instruction must include all of the characteristics of overall excellent teaching – not simply teaching literacy but also effective teaching strategies and classroom management,

teacher reflection, and relationships with parents. Descriptors of observable behavior were identified and placed along a continuum to exemplify expected behaviors of teachers at the four stages of development. Classroom observations of reading instruction and focused interviews with teachers, principals, and reading specialists were conducted to determine the degree to which the CETT training and professional development was applied and effective in changing teacher practice. These findings were compared with groups of non-CETT teachers (applying the same protocols) in schools with populations similar to the CETT schools.

MAJOR FINDINGS

CETT programs in the Andes, Caribbean, and Central America were all successful in training teachers to improve literacy instruction. In each subregion, CETT teachers had reached higher levels of professional development on a majority of the dimensions studied than had similar teachers who had not participated in CETT.

- ◆ *One of the most promising findings of the study is that CETT teachers are more reflective about their practice, able to examine their assumptions about what kind of teaching works best. Teachers who reflect on their practices, self-evaluate, and discuss what and how they are changing, can be proactive in identifying areas for further growth.*
- ◆ *CETT teachers provided more opportunities for their students to practice oral and written expression. Over 80 percent of CETT teachers implemented such practices.*
- ◆ *The majority of CETT teachers used practices that promoted development of comprehension and vocabulary building skills, by encouraging students to make inferences when responding to questions.*
- ◆ *In classrooms with CETT teachers, the observers noted significantly more frequent and adept use of effective instructional skills, in ways that have been seen to improve student outcomes.*
- ◆ *Evaluators cited a need for more training in the area of writing. Though CETT teachers were rated more highly on this dimension than were non-CETT, few had reached mastery.*
- ◆ *In all subregions, few CETT teachers could be said to be at the Mastery level as defined in the study. The evaluation team saw this as understandable, given the breadth of the training. However, CETT teachers had made genuine progress in both knowledge and application.*
- ◆ *Differentiated instruction is another area where additional professional development is needed. One of the more complex instructional skills to master, this dimension was very infrequently observed during the study.*
- ◆ *Evaluators noted a need for increased teacher training in managing classroom behavior, also affecting another dimension—the use of students’ time. As the teachers are learning to employ such an array of new skills, their ability to engage students at all times tends to ebb and flow. Positive difference was seen, however, between CETT and non-CETT teachers.*

Recommendations

Though CETT teachers clearly received higher ratings than non-CETT teachers on almost all dimensions examined in the study, few had consistently reached mastery or near-mastery. This indicates a need for further intervention. *After examining the main findings of the research, the study team’s key cross-regional recommendation is that all CETT teachers need additional*

training in most areas of professional development. The danger of leaving teachers with this partial development is that they will not be able to sustain the gains or proceed to improve them.

Moreover, teachers who complete their training at a level of near mastery and mastery are more likely to be willing and able to share that knowledge with another generation of teachers.

Teachers have made great strides, but need deeper knowledge, practice and confidence to be able to mentor others and take on leadership roles in their schools and teacher circles. The study findings support deepening the training of teachers, rather than simply adding more teachers.

The study team advises greater training in using assessment data to inform instruction, group students, and select appropriate materials. Such changes will lead to greater student engagement, and thereby more effective use of instructional time. As this series of dimensions illustrates, our findings warrant a recommendation *that training move from a focus simply on instruction by elements to more comprehensive training that cuts across elements.*

Specific recommendations for improving the training in key areas are outlined below.

Basic Reading Skills

Implementation of phonological awareness activities has been consistent but teachers are not accurately assessing student progress. Teachers need to be able to determine students' individual needs, and use techniques to address them. Teachers should also learn to provide students more independent reading opportunities, and to provide multiple opportunities to build fluency.

Understanding Text

Teachers need training on strategy instruction in comprehension, vocabulary development, and questioning. Teachers should be trained to provide students opportunities for wide reading to develop students' abilities to build vocabulary and comprehension in their independent reading.

Oral and Written Expression

Training should now focus training on strategies for conducting "read alouds," the writing process, effective writing practices such as the use of planning sheets and graphic organizers, and oral language activities in a variety of formats and for a variety of functions.

Instructional Practices

Teachers have enhanced their instructional practices, and should be trained on guided and independent practice; these skills were used less often as were the effective use of corrective feedback and scaffolding.

Classroom Management

It is advised that the CETTs provide additional training in various grouping formats and the use of assessment data to group students for various purposes. The training should also provide positive behavior management practices, and a stronger focus on the effective use of time.

Reflective Practices

Although many teachers are able to articulate an educational philosophy, this knowledge is not always translated into practice: understanding the theory, they must test out and adopt the new practices. CETTs should focus on deepening teachers' knowledge of various methodologies and their appropriate use. Trainers' visits to classrooms should include candid feedback on how a teacher's performance meets the theoretical goals of the methods practiced.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	8
II.	Program Background	8
A.	Teacher Training	9
1.	Reading Instruction	9
2.	Reading Instruction for Struggling Readers	10
3.	Translating Research to Practice.....	10
4.	Effective Teacher-training Practices.....	10
B.	Assessment.....	10
C.	Materials	11
D.	Applied Research	11
E.	Information and Communication Technology	11
F.	CETT Population	12
1.	Andean CETT	12
2.	Caribbean CETT	13
3.	Central America and Dominican Republic CETT	13
III.	Conceptual Underpinnings of the Reflective Study.....	14
A.	Best Practices	15
B.	Four Stages of Development.....	15
IV.	Methodology	16
A.	Study Questions	16
B.	Design	16
C.	Sample.....	17
E.	Procedures.....	18
F.	Data Analysis	18
G.	Assumptions.....	18
V.	Findings.....	19
A.	Overall trends: CETT versus Non-CETT	20
1.	Basic Reading Skills	20
2.	Understanding Text.....	21
3.	Oral and Written Expression.....	23
4.	Instructional Practices	24
5.	Classroom Management.....	26
6.	Reflective Practice	28
7.	Parental Involvement	30
8.	Gender Differences	31
9.	Student Attendance	31
B.	Factors Contributing to Implementation of Successful Practices	32
1.	Overall Teacher Experience.....	32
2.	Amount of Training	33
3.	Training Follow-up	33
4.	Teachers' Views on Usefulness of Training	34
5.	Teachers' Pedagogical Approaches	35
6.	Teacher Motivation.....	36
7.	Principal Experience and Support.....	36

C.	Obstacles to the Implementation of Successful Practices	36
1.	Student Socio-Economic Status	37
2.	School Size.....	37
3.	School Location	37
4.	School Type	37
5.	Teacher-Identified Difficulties in Implementation	37
6.	Teacher-Identified Training Needs	38
7.	Teacher Suggestions for Improving CETT	39
D.	Subregional Variation in the Implementation of Successful Practices	40
1.	Andean CETT Successful Practices.....	40
2.	Caribbean CETT Successful Practices.....	41
3.	CETT Central America–Dominican Republic Successful Practices	42
E.	School-level Factors.....	43
1.	Overall Trends CETT versus Non-CETT	43
2.	Factors Contributing to Implementation of Successful Practices	45
3.	Obstacles to the Implementation of Successful Practices	49
VI.	Conclusions.....	51
VII.	Recommendations.....	52

TABLES AND FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Trends in Teaching Basic Reading Skills – Overall CETT and non-CETT	20
Table 2: Trends in Teaching Understanding of Text – Overall CETT and non-CETT	21
Table 3: Trends in Teaching Oral and Written Expression – CETT and non-CETT	23
Table 4: Trends in Employing Instructional Practices – CETT and non-CETT.....	25
Table 5: Trends in Classroom Management – CETT and non-CETT	27
Table 6: Reflective Practice in Teaching – CETT and non-CETT	29
Table 7: Parental Involvement – CETT and non-CETT	31
Table 8: Average Single Day Attendance of CETT and non-CETT Students	32
Table 9: Overall Trends in Amount of Training - CETT Teachers	33
Table 10: Overall Trends in Frequency of Follow-up - CETT Teachers	33
Table 11: Useful Aspects of Training – CETT Teachers	34
Table 12: Change in Practice as a Result of Training – CETT Teachers	35
Table 13: CETT Teacher Pedagogical Approaches.....	35
Table 14: Teacher Identified Obstacles to Implementation.....	38
Table 15: Teacher Identified Areas for Additional Training.....	39
Table 16: Teacher Suggestions for Improving CETT.....	39
Table 17: Andean CETT Successful Practices	40
Table 18: Caribbean CETT Successful Practices	41
Table 19: CETT CA-RD Successful Practices	43
Table 20: CETT vs. non-CETT: Summary of Principals' Responses	44
Table 21: Principal Identified Most Useful Aspects of Principal Training	46
Table 22: Principal Identified Successful Aspects of Teacher Training.....	47
Table 23: Principals' Suggestions for the CETT Project.....	50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: CETT Teacher Use of Phonological Awareness Strategies	21
Figure 2: CETT Teacher Instruction for Understanding Text	22
Figure 3: CETT Teacher Practices in Oral and Written Expression.....	24
Figure 4: CETT Teacher Use of Instructional Practices.....	25
Figure 5: CETT Teacher Use of Classroom Management Techniques	28
Figure 6: CETT Teacher Use of Reflective Practice	30
Figure 7: CETT Teacher Developing Understanding of the Purposes of Written Language	42
Figure 8: Principals' Comments about Changes in Their Role	46

REFLECTIVE STUDY OF TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHER TRAINING - LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN - 2004 FINAL REPORT

I. Introduction

This report presents the results of a qualitative study of the impact of the Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETT) professional development program for teachers during its first year of implementation. The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which ongoing professional development for teachers that included knowledge and use of assessment measures, of the critical elements of reading instruction associated with improved outcomes, and of effective instructional practices, was successful in changing teacher practice.

Aguirre International study teams first undertook a pilot study in two countries in the Caribbean, and then visited six countries in Central America-Dominican Republic and the Andes between April and October 2004, visiting a sample of CETT and non-CETT schools at the end of their respective school years. In each country, team members visited first grade classrooms and interviewed teachers, principals, and project personnel. The report first provides background on the CETT program, conceptual underpinnings and methodology of the study, and then presents findings at the teacher and school level, concluding with implications and recommendations.

II. Program Background

The Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETT) are the result of an initiative that was announced at the 2001 Summit of the Americas. USAID provided over \$20 million to establish three centers charged with improving in-service teachers' ability to teach literacy skills to children in first to third grades in marginalized communities in Central America-Dominican Republic, South America, and the Caribbean, with the objective of reducing the high rates of illiteracy and school underachievement. The project was designed as a public-private partnership; thus matching resources are being sought from US- and region-based private sector partners, including corporations, foundations, and other entities.

The Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETTs) were established to improve in-service teachers' ability to teach literacy skills to children in first to third grades in marginalized communities in Central America-Dominican Republic, South America, and the Caribbean, with the objective of reducing the high rates of illiteracy and school underachievement.

The CETTs are implemented by universities in the region. In Central America and the Dominican Republic, the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional Francisco Morazán in Honduras leads a consortium of universities and other institutions in implementing the program. The Central America and Dominican Republic CETT (CA-RD CETT) is active in the Dominican

Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Dr. Carleton Corrales serves as the Director under the guidance of an Executive Committee composed of senior representatives of the participating institutions. The Caribbean CETT is directed from the University of the West Indies by Professor Errol Miller. It is active in Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and has launched in Grenada and Trinidad and Tobago. In the Andes, the Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia collaborates with two other universities to implement the program and is active in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. The Andean CETT is led by Dr. Manuel Bello. Under USAID funding, the CETTs are expected to reach some 15,000 teachers and 450,000 students in up to 20 Latin American and Caribbean countries. So far, 6200 teachers have been trained, serving over 175,000 students.

Since the early discussions of the program, the program has been guided by a generally agreed-upon set of program components. These components form the common backbone of the program, which has been implemented in different ways in the three subregions. Thus, the goal of the CETTs is to enhance the instructional practice of in-service teachers through training that addresses those components:

- promoting the development of skills and strategies for teaching reading, by aligning existing pedagogical practice with research-based best practices, for a student population with a wide range of abilities and backgrounds;
- using a variety of assessment tools to better diagnose and address students' learning needs;
- developing a diverse bank of materials to support the CETT program;
- using applied research to test the CETT tools and techniques for pedagogical soundness and ease of integration into classroom practice; and
- applying information and communication technology to develop distance training programs and to increase communication among partner institutions.

Objectives and expected outcomes were identified for each component. These are presented in the following sections.

A. Teacher Training

Across the CETTs, the teacher-training component has four objectives that address reading instruction, reading instruction for struggling readers, the translation of research to practice, and the development and implementation of effective teacher-training practices.

1. Reading Instruction

To enable teachers to teach reading more effectively, teachers were provided training to increase their knowledge of reading instruction and develop skill in implementing effective instructional practices. Across the three CETTs, training topics provided to teachers included the components of reading, the features of effective instruction, motivation, self-esteem and classroom climate, and evaluation. The seven components of reading, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, oral expression, written expression, and vocabulary, provide the foundation for integrated reading and language arts instruction.

2. Reading Instruction for Struggling Readers

To prepare teachers to meet the needs of all students more effectively, training is designed to strengthen teachers' and administrators' knowledge of and skill with strategies, methods, tools, and techniques for teaching struggling readers. Assessment is used to monitor student progress and plan instruction. Assessment data provides teacher information to group and regroup students for instruction, to determine instructional goals, and to adjust instruction.

3. Translating Research to Practice

CETT training was designed to give teachers theoretical knowledge about reading instruction, and also to empower them to apply new practices in their classrooms, test their own understanding of new concepts, and make use of what they learn to improve instruction.

4. Effective Teacher-training Practices

The final objective addresses the development and implementation of effective teacher-training methods. Across the CETTs, the training model consists of three modalities: large group formal workshops, small group study circles, and one-on-one in classroom follow-up with a trainer. Each component is designed using a constructivist philosophy and methodology of training that includes the principles of adult learning.

CETTs in each subregion have designed and mounted their training and follow-up efforts with several specific outcomes in mind. These include:

- The development of a set of proven training strategies for teachers of the early primary grades relevant to the different social, cultural, and linguistic contexts characterizing poor populations;
- A set of in-service teacher training modules for teaching reading, assessing reading skills, and applying appropriate corrective strategies;
- Training modules designed and formatted for use through information and communication technologies and available on CETT websites; and
- A network of alliances and formal agreements with local institutions specialized in managing and carrying out training programs for teachers of the early primary grades.

The broader outcomes in each subregion, therefore, are systemic, resulting in sustainable materials and significant local capacity building. These are occurring organically, in the carrying out of the program, and will affect many more teachers and students even after the project closes.

B. Assessment

Assessment is a critical part of instruction. A variety of assessment tools are needed to effectively diagnose student difficulties and evaluate student progress. The objectives in the area of assessment address the development and implementation of assessment measures for a variety of purposes. To ensure that diagnostic and performance measures are administered correctly and that teachers use data to implement appropriate remediation strategies, training to improve teachers' knowledge and skills is provided. In addition, teachers are provided training to improve their skills in maintaining records of students' performance and achievement in order to transmit them from year to year. Training also examines how such records afford teachers with opportunities to self-evaluate their teaching. Finally, teachers learn how to provide information,

to parents and community members, about student performance and the benefits of reading in simple and accessible language.

While not yet completed, it is expected that following extensive pilot testing, a set of diagnostic and assessment tools, guides for teachers, and systems for recording students' educational history will have been created and distributed. To achieve this, stakeholders in the project are establishing a network of international alliances with people and institutions concerned with diagnosis and assessment of student learning in reading.

C. Materials

A diverse bank of materials has been developed to support CETT programming. These materials differ by locale and educational circumstances, including local linguistic concerns. This component is ongoing and iterative, with new materials constantly being piloted, validated, updated, and created anew. Materials with diverse purposes have been created; some of these are listed below.

- Modules and research results used for training trainers;
- Training modules for participating teachers, providing pedagogically sound practices, taught in a manner consistent with the principles of adult learning;
- Classroom materials for primary students, developed to complement those provided by Ministries of Education;
- Simple evaluative tools for teachers' use with individuals and small groups, both for struggling readers and for day-to-day diagnostic use;
- Reading materials for children, culturally and grade-level appropriate and varied;
- Materials for school administrators on education management and pedagogical support for the school-level effort of teacher professional development; and
- Materials to evaluate teacher classroom performance.

D. Applied Research

To determine the efficacy of the practices being developed through the project and to establish a research base, this component begins with a research agenda that will systematically test the CETT tools and techniques to ensure they are pedagogically sound. A second goal of this component is applied research that can be integrated easily into classroom practice, to give teachers ways to monitor and investigate the results of the changes they are implementing. It also involves training teachers to develop their own action research projects to identify and analyze problem situations to improve teaching practices.

Findings from these projects, as well as information collected about successful practices, are to be made available on the CETT websites and through workshops specifically designed for educators, Ministry officials, and other stakeholders. CETT administration will also share applied research results with Ministry of Education contacts, in an effort to influence policy with helpful findings.

E. Information and Communication Technology

Objectives in this component are intended to extend the reach of the CETTs through the use of various media. Among the goals are to increase communication among partner institutions

within and across participating countries, to develop distance training programs, to increase the use of information technology in instruction, and to create multimedia resource centers.

Expected outcomes for this component include the identification of appropriate options for distance learning, development and production of appropriate technology to complement, enhance, and reinforce the training, development of training modules designed specifically for use with ICT, the establishment of telecenters, and the training of 2,000 teachers through distance education.

F. CETT Population

1. Andean CETT

The Andean CETT has provided training to over 3000 teachers in grades K-3 in Bolivia and Peru, and grades 1-3 in Ecuador, in over 300 schools. Teachers trained in all three countries work with Spanish-speaking students in poor areas in the outskirts of cities. In Peru the project was implemented in Lima, Cuzco, and Piura. Training began in August 2003 for approximately 300 teachers (200 in Lima, 50 in Cuzco and 50 in Piura). Since then, in a second full cycle of training, nearly 900 additional teachers entered the program in Peru, from a total of 130 schools, serving approximately 40,000 students.

In August of 2003, training began for 283 Bolivian teachers in kindergarten through 3rd grade in 46 schools. Those teachers are in Santa Cruz and its peripheral urban areas of Montero and Portachuelo, and are now in their second year in the CETT. In February 2004, 575 additional teachers in Sucre and Santa Cruz began a cycle of training. The Santa Cruz area included the three school districts of Santa Cruz, and the districts of Montero, Portachuelo and Cotoca. A second site was established in the Department of Chuquisaca, serving schools in Sucre and Yotala. Over 30,000 Bolivian students are taught by CETT-trained teachers.

In Ecuador, many schools have been grouped into administrative networks by the government, with the goal of increased collaboration among networked schools. All schools in the eight Quito-area networks qualified and were selected for the CETT project. Because the project wished to serve additional schools, two more networks on the outskirts of Quito were established especially to participate in the CETT. Currently, just fewer than 1000 teachers in 88 schools, serving over 34,000 children, are participating in the program. The CETT in Ecuador is not providing services in bilingual schools this year; however, some of the CETT schools provide a special program that serves children of families who have migrated to Quito. These children come to school speaking varied other languages, but are taught to read in Spanish.

In addition, dozens of expert trainers have been trained in the three countries. They provide face-to-face workshops and visit classrooms to observe and counsel teachers under their charge. Over 500 school principals have been trained as well, in order to provide in-school pedagogical support for CETT teachers. An additional 150 teachers from across the subregion recently completed a pilot Distance Learning training course, parallel to the full CETT teacher training.

2. Caribbean CETT

The Caribbean CETT is training teachers in Grades 1, 2, and 3. Some 700 teachers have been trained in the 142 designated project schools, serving over 17,000 students. An additional 900 teachers are also participating in the training. These generally teach in other grades in the project schools or are pre-service teachers; for example, in St. Lucia, a decision was made by the principals of the project schools to include the whole staff of each school in the training. Training is provided by the trainer, whom they call the Reading Specialist in the Caribbean. In addition, in St. Lucia, Belize and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, where Kindergarten is part of the primary school system, the Grade K teachers have been integrated into the training. Others of these additional trainees were teachers from other primary schools who were invited to attend the training workshops. The costs of training these additional participants have been borne by the Ministry of Education or the respective Teachers' College. In addition, 31 school principals have been trained in the Caribbean.

In the Caribbean CETT, ten Reading Specialists train the teachers in their respective areas, with six in Jamaica and one each in the other countries. Based at the Teachers' Colleges in each country, these Specialists have set up Literacy Resource Centers accessible to the teachers with whom they work. They also carry out observational visits to each teacher's classroom, and facilitate the literacy circles in which CETT teachers participate as part of ongoing training and development. Moreover, in the Caribbean, the Reading Specialists have launched a distinctive effort in Applied Research. Each teacher is asked to identify a research question for his or her classroom, and to devise and carry out strategies of intervention for that question, over the course of the school year. The teachers keep a log of activities and outcomes with respect to this intervention, under the monitoring of the Reading Specialists, and write up the results of their research at the end of the school year.

3. Central America and Dominican Republic CETT

The Central America and Dominican Republic CETT (CA-RD CETT) planned and provided training for first grade teachers, of which 1600 have been trained. In contrast to the Andean and Caribbean CETTs, which provided their training to groups of first, second and third grade teachers (and in some cases, kindergarten) from the beginning, CA-RD CETT planners decided to work sequentially, developing the program for first grade teachers in the first year, for second grade teachers in the second year, and for third grade teachers in the third year. Teachers trained worked solely with Spanish-speaking students, except in Guatemala, where some bilingual schools have been added to the CETT training. Teachers in both rural and urban schools are participating in CETT.

In addition, dozens of expert trainers have been trained in all five countries. They provide large group workshops, facilitate small group study circles, and visit classrooms to observe and counsel teachers under their charge.

In CA-RD CETT, 49 Ministry officials and 213 principals have been trained across the subregion. For the Ministries of Education, this has meant more involvement in CETT and greater buy-in, including efforts in Nicaragua and Honduras to expand CETT programming with funding from the government. While the efforts are still far from making CETT training part of official ministry pedagogies, efforts in these countries have shown that a proactive relationship

with the Ministries can generate interest and collaboration. For school principals, training has varied from full participation in teacher training sessions to special curricula to support their school-wide role.

In Honduras, 108 teachers were initially selected in 67 schools in the Department of San Francisco Morazán, the department in which Tegucigalpa is located. These schools, serving approximately 3100 first-graders, are located in predominantly poor, rural or periurban communities. These schools included 15 one-teacher schools, in which one teacher teaches all of the primary grades, and 16 two-teacher schools.

Training in Nicaragua was initiated February 2004 for first-grade teachers in 75 schools and 4 Ministry supervisors. Professors from three normal schools (Jinotepe, Chinandega, and Matagalpa) provided the training. In several schools with more than one first grade teacher, only one was selected for training. This differs from teacher selection in other CETT countries, where CETT management attempted to include in the training all teachers from an affected school.¹

The program began working with 100 teachers in Guatemala in November of 2003. In February 2004, an additional 119 teachers were added. The CETT received additional funds to hire three additional trainers, serving 14 teachers who teach in school with large numbers of bilingual students. Project teachers serve approximately 6,500 students in 119 schools in 6 departments. Training was provided in three locations: Antigua, Sololá, and El Progreso.

In El Salvador, teachers in 84 schools in one department, Chaletenango, are participating in the project. Training took place in three sites: Nueva Concepción, Chaletenango, and San Salvador.

In the Dominican Republic, CETT has trained 425 teachers; of these, 110 teach second grade, and the rest teach first. Teachers were trained in Santiago in the first year. Since August 2004, 103 teachers in three other marginal urban areas have begun their training. A further 154 principals and ministry personnel also have been included in the training.

III. Conceptual Underpinnings of the Reflective Study

Needs assessments conducted prior to the implementation of CETT indicated that reading achievement was critically low across countries in the LAC subregions. This was especially true in the more remote and disadvantaged schools, which are the targets of the program. Teachers in many instances received very poor training or none at all in the teaching of reading. Classroom sizes range from 20 to 60 pupils. Materials are outdated or lacking. Reading books and textbooks are rare. Student absenteeism is high. Students come from families where literacy is not a priority, and children come to school without many of the pre-reading skills and experiences that are necessary to a good reading foundation. In some countries, system-level conditions such as strikes and non-payment of wages affect the education environment. It is against this background that CETT sought to make a difference in reading achievement, and it is

¹ The advantage in Nicaragua is wider diffusion of CETT to more schools. The disadvantage is the lack of day-to-day support from other teachers in the same school also undergoing the training. (Latter is, of course, also the case for the 20% of schools with only one first grade class.)

with this information in mind that the evaluators sought a way to characterize the progress of CETT teachers.

The conceptual framework underlying the design of this study is that teacher change is a gradual and continuous process. To examine this process, the study team developed a research-based list of Best Practices to serve as the basis for a four-stage model for observing teachers. This section first discusses the Best Practices and then outlines the four-stage model.

A. Best Practices

The literature on effective reading instruction identifies expertise and competencies that are associated with improved student outcomes. Introducing these elements of instruction, intervention and assessment does imply a dramatic change in curriculum, but more importantly, it requires teachers to change several aspects of their daily practice and often involves changes in long-held beliefs and educational philosophy. To effect such a change, teacher professional development research recommends certain adult learning techniques and methods to facilitate learning. First, a collaborative learning environment promises better teacher outcomes in improved teacher knowledge and skills. Second, as teachers learn, they are more successful when they have input in decision-making and problem solving and receive feedback as new methods are put into practice. Third, it is also vital that new methods be introduced as part of coherent programs, and that student data be collected, so that teachers can examine the effects of implementing new methods.

To observe the progress of CETT teachers in the change process, a list of research-based Best Practices was developed for use in all three subregions. Effective literacy instruction must include all of the characteristics of overall excellent teaching, and it takes place in a whole class environment; therefore the list includes components specific not only to teaching literacy, but also effective teaching strategies and classroom management practices, teacher reflection, and relationships with parents. Dimensions that address the areas of interest in this project were analyzed and critical variables were identified. Descriptors of observable behaviors for each variable were identified and placed along a continuum to exemplify expected behaviors of teachers at four stages of development. Annex A presents the list of Best Practices and Annex B presents a Glossary of Terms; the stages of development, also presented in Annex C, are described below.

B. Four Stages of Development

In observing teachers for this study, four stages along the developmental continuum were used. Teachers at the first stage, *Initiating*, implement reading, assessment, and instructional practice inefficiently or not at all. Reasons for this level of implementation may be lack of knowledge, difficulty in implementation, or resentment of change. At a second stage, *Becoming*, many teachers have become conversant with the new jargon, and may try to implement some of the new practices. This stage has also been called *Form without Substance* because teachers do not yet understand the new practices and material learned in any depth, and are applying them both incompletely and superficially.

With adequate training and coaching, many will move on to a third stage, *Near Mastery*, in which they understand the advantages of the new methods and have evidence of the efficacy of

the practices since their students are beginning to learn more. Even at this stage, many teachers still have not mastered the new practices and may require additional training.

At the fourth stage, *Mastery*, teachers have fully assimilated the new practices, may be considered “master teachers,” and can be excellent mentors or trainers for others.

Due to previous experiences and training, teachers may be at different stages along the continuum in different dimensions. Movement along the continuum may also be influenced by training, knowledge, and opportunities to implement the new practices. For that reason it was essential to include in the study a sample of non-CETT schools for comparison purposes. A more complete description of the four stages is presented in Annex C.

IV. Methodology

A. Study Questions

The research questions were developed through discussions with CETT personnel, USAID education officers, and other specialists involved in early childhood reading education. The study questions for the reflective study of teacher practice focused on the training provided by the CETT program, level of professional development achieved by teachers who participated in the program and the factors contributing to implementation of the training in project schools. In order to establish a baseline for determining professional development, schools similar to the CETT schools, but with teachers not participating in the program, were also studied. Within each set of research questions, the emphasis was on assisting the managers of the CETT programs to fine-tune their training strategies and to determine those elements of the program that, when implemented effectively, were critical to teacher performance. The general research questions were:

- What is the effect of the CETT training on literacy practices of teachers?
- What factors contribute to teachers’ ability to implement these practices?
- What obstacles and impediments make it difficult for them to do so?
- What differences are noted between CETT and non-CETT schools in the implementation of desired best practices?
- Are differences noted between countries or subregions attributable to different training contents or implementation models?
- Are differences noted in student attendance and dropout rates in classrooms observed?
- What are the training practices that have been successful across the three CETT programs?
- Are there successful training practices that are unique to a CETT that might prove useful to the other CETTs?

B. Design

A multi-method design, consisting of checklists, classroom observation forms, professional development rating forms, and focused interviews for teachers, school principals, and CETT technicians and administrators, was employed to measure the implementation of the CETT training across the Latin America and Caribbean Region. The study was designed as an Implementation Validation Study at the classroom and school level to examine the degree to which teachers are implementing Best Practices in reading instruction taught through the professional development activities of the CETTs (as well as to identify impediments to the

implementation of what had been taught). Ideally the design would examine change over time through repetition in subsequent school years. Further, the study is conceived to have a formative function. It is expected that study findings will be used to inform and modify practices in the CETTs, to improve performance and outcomes at all levels.

C. Sample

The sample, which included data from the pilot study undertaken in the Caribbean, consisted of 114 teachers nested within 67 schools in eight countries (Belize, Jamaica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru). For consistency across the regional sample, classrooms where either English or Spanish was the language of instruction were selected. CETT personnel working with the schools were asked to stratify them in terms of three levels of implementation (well implemented, average implementation, and low implementation)². These ratings were used as proxies for degree of implementation. At least two schools were then randomly selected from each country within each stratum. Since the CETT CA-RD had decided to focus its efforts on first grade teachers in the first year of implementation, this study looked at first grade classrooms across the subregions, to form a basis for comparisons. Where possible all participating first grade teachers in a sample school were included in the study. In addition, at least two schools in each country that did not participate in the CETT program were selected and first grade teachers asked to participate for comparison purposes. The sample by country is as follows:

Caribbean Pilot

- Belize – 3 CETT and 1 comparison school: 4 CETT teachers, 1 comparison
- Jamaica – 2 CETT and 1 comparison school: 4 CETT teachers, 2 comparison

Central America

- Guatemala – 7 CETT and 3 comparison schools: 14 CETT teachers, 4 comparison
- Honduras – 7 CETT and 2 comparison schools: 12 CETT teachers, 3 comparison
- Nicaragua – 8 CETT and 3 comparison schools: 12 CETT teachers, 4 comparison

South America (Andean CETT)

- Bolivia – 8 CETT and 2 comparison schools: 13 CETT teachers and 4 comparison
- Ecuador – 9 CETT and 2 comparison schools: 17 CETT teachers, 3 comparison
- Peru – 7 CETT and 2 comparison schools: 13 CETT teachers and 4 comparison

Totals: 51 CETT and 16 comparison schools; 89 CETT teachers and 25 comparison

D. Instruments

In order to implement the multi-method design of the study, a series of instruments was developed. Qualitative instruments including checklists of language learning strategies in classrooms with children whose mother tongue was not the language of instruction, structured observation forms for recording teacher behavior, rating scales, and observational checklists, as well as open-ended interview protocols for trainers, principals and teachers were employed. The principal observational instrument was the rating scale, which measured use of internationally accepted “best practices” in the teaching of reading across 6 areas and 21 dimensions of

² In practice, terminology for the categories varied slightly from country to country, but all systems included three levels of enthusiasm for and compliance with the project.

pedagogical practice. Further, since attendance is widely seen to contribute to school success, daily attendance for the days of observation was collected. All protocols used are included in Annex D.

E. Procedures

In order to capture information at a point when the maximum level of implementation had occurred, data collection was carried out as close as possible to the end of the school year in all countries. A team of four to five people, consisting of international education specialists and at least one local consultant, carried out the research. Prior to fieldwork a half-day training session was held in each country with the research team. Instruments were reviewed and field procedures simulated with videotapes of classroom lessons. At the end of the session, inter-observer consistency was measured. Consistency averaged 82.5 percent across twenty different field personnel taking part in the training, considered a high level of consistency by researchers. Additional fine-tuning of observations took place during the first day of fieldwork, when researchers conducted parallel observations in the same classrooms.

Field procedures consisted of one to three person teams visiting a school for one day. The team carried out visits in each country over a period of approximately one and a half weeks.

Researchers asked sample teachers to perform a “model lesson” that exemplified what they had learned in the CETT training, and researchers generally observed the entire language arts lesson for that day. Observers kept running narratives and completed a structured observation form for each lesson observed. Other aspects of classroom management were also recorded with rating forms and checklists. Researchers complemented the observations with a follow-up interview with each teacher on the model lesson and the CETT training received. School principals were also interviewed on the school level implementation of CETT training. Quality control was maintained through training to establish inter-observer reliability, development of field manuals and operational definitions, and ongoing review of data by all members of the field team.

F. Data Analysis

Instruments were scored to determine levels or stages of teacher implementation of best practices. Comparisons were made across group and with the comparison group schools using chi-square analysis to examine professional development for the entire CETT, and to examine subregional trends. Interview data were summarized using relative and absolute frequencies to examine teacher reflection on their practice as expressed in the interviews and the principals’ interviews on school level implementation.

Observational data were analyzed by developing codes for the key areas of interest and using Max QDA, a software package for qualitative data analysis. Blocks of data for each of the areas of teacher practice were aggregated from different data sources to examine common and unique trends in each area of interest. Such trends are used to illustrate the quantitative analyses.

G. Assumptions

The study was based on several assumptions. First, the school and the class are the key units of analysis in planning and intervening to improve the quality and efficiency of education. Second, it was assumed that the CETT intervention would effect observable teacher change, which the study would capture, and which would readily show difference in comparison to teachers in

similar schools without CETT training.³ Finally, accurate assessment of educational innovation is a complex undertaking requiring the integration of multiple methodological approaches. Such in-depth qualitative work requires certain choices to be made that may limit the breadth of the study. In this case, very rural schools and schools with programs for students whose mother tongue was not the language of instruction were not included in the study for the sake of consistency. In addition, because of scheduling and financial limitations, not all countries participating in the CETT were visited.

V. Findings

This section will detail the major findings discovered in the study, beginning with a comparison between CETT and non-CETT schools across the dimensions measured. Twenty-one reading and instructional practices that are related to the goals of the project were clustered and examined. Reading elements included practices that develop both receptive and expressive language skills. Although the focus was on reading skills, speaking, listening, and writing instruction were also addressed. The specific categories of effective reading instruction included: basic reading skills, understanding text; and oral and written expression. The areas of best practice examined were instructional practice, classroom management, reflective teaching and parental involvement. Overall differences in teacher practice between teachers in the CETT program and similar teachers not receiving CETT training were also examined in terms of gender. Finally, differences in student attendance in CETT and non-CETT classrooms were explored.

Then data are parsed to highlight any factors that particularly contribute to, or detract from, successful implementation. The study authors examined whether the following teacher, principal, school and student characteristics had discernible relationships with the degree to which the teachers successfully implemented CETT methodologies: number of years of experience reported; amount of training reported; amount of follow-up reported; opinions reported on usefulness of training; pedagogical approaches reported; motivation level; principal's years of experience; student socio-economic status; school size; school location – urban or rural; or school type – graded vs. multi-grade.

Other possible obstacles to implementation are then explored; these include the implementation difficulties and additional training needs that teachers themselves identified, and teachers' suggestions for improving CETT.

Next, the report discusses subregional variations in the implementation of successful practices. This section details the dimensions along which teachers in each subregional CETT were observed to excel. Finally, particular school-level factors are considered, in comparison to non-CETT school factors, and again those factors that affected successful implementation.

³ A related assumption of the CETT activity is that these teacher changes would result in improved student achievement outcomes, which are to be collected separately by the CETTs. The relationship between teacher and student change, however, is beyond the scope of this study.

A. Overall trends: CETT versus Non-CETT

1. Basic Reading Skills

The basic reading skills category includes the three dimensions of reading necessary for emergent readers to develop decoding and encoding skills. *Phonological awareness* instruction develops the awareness that words are composed of sounds and that those sounds can be manipulated. *Phonics* instruction helps students develop the knowledge that spoken sounds can be mapped onto printed letters or letter clusters. This knowledge is necessary for both reading and spelling. Once students can read words, *fluency building* instruction is provided to ensure students read text accurately, fluently, and with prosody. Reading fluency is associated with increased comprehension.

Consistent with CETT training, the majority of CETT teachers provided instruction that develops students' phonological awareness. As shown in Table 1, over 70 percent of the CETT teachers emphasized the learning of the sounds of letters and tied this learning directly to print. Over 40 percent of the CETT teachers had integrated phonological awareness into writing instruction as well. The majority of non-CETT teachers, on the other hand, were not observed to implement activities that develop phonological awareness explicitly or in the teaching of reading or writing. Non-CETT teachers taught letter names but not letter sounds.

Table 1: Trends in Teaching Basic Reading Skills – Overall CETT and non-CETT

Dimension	Program	Stage I: Initiating	Stage II: Form w/o Substance	Stage III: Near Mastery	Stage IV: Mastery	Chi Square
Phonological Awareness	CETT	29.2%	27.0%	43.8%	0	11.505**
	Non-CETT	56.0%	36.0%	8.0%	0	
Phonics	CETT	27.0%	53.9%	18.0%	1.1%	3.523
	Non-CETT	28.0%	68.0%	4.0%	0	
Fluency	CETT	66.3%	22.5%	9.0%	2.2%	5.164
	Non-CETT	71.1%	20.2%	7.0%	1.8%	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

CETT Teachers were observed to employ these phonological awareness techniques rarely – it appeared that students had by and large moved past the stage of needing the sounding-out techniques to be able to read. Though the study was not conceived as a measure of student outcomes, on an impressionistic level the evaluators agreed that student reading was further developed in CETT schools than in non-CETT. Teachers, too, told evaluators that most of their first-grade students could read, and that this was a clear difference from the prior year. Again, this data is impressionistic, but some evidence does point to its validity.

In the other basic reading skills of phonics and fluency, CETT teachers showed less change from teachers who had not had CETT training. Although over 70 percent of CETT teachers were observed to provide students with opportunities to apply decoding and word identification skills in controlled text, teachers in the comparison group used similar strategies. Instruction to build fluency was one of the least developed areas among CETT teachers, as a majority was not observed to provide instruction related to this dimension of basic reading. CETT and non-CETT

teachers were almost identical in their distribution on this dimension. Figure 1 illustrates the types of strategies employed by CETT teachers.

Figure 1: CETT Teacher Use of Phonological Awareness Strategies

Juana is a 35 year-old teacher who is in her initial year of teaching first grade. She teaches at a large urban school in a peripheral area of Quito. She has already identified the topic of today's lesson by having one of the students read a riddle to the others. After they successfully identify butterfly (*mariposa*), Juana puts a poster on the board with the story of the lives of *mariposas*. She says she is going to read the story first and that the students should listen closely and correct her if she makes a mistake in pronunciation. After she reads, she divides the children in two groups and each group reads the story. Then she asks questions about the story and follows this up by singing a song about *mariposas* with the children.

Continuing the lesson, she puts up a different picture of a butterfly and explains that while looking at the picture the students should identify the sounds of the word *mariposa*. A girl volunteers and says "/m/." The teacher says "*Muy bien*" (Very good) and lifts a flap below the picture, revealing a pouch that contains the letter "m." She repeats this process with each letter and then has the children make up sentences about the *mariposa*.

Juana then switches to a writing exercise where after cutting a piece of paper into eighths and writing each of the letters of *mariposa*, each student is told to mix up the letters. Then the teacher says, "We are going to play with these sounds and write new words." She demonstrates how four of the letters can be used to form "*rama*" pronouncing each of the sounds, as she puts the letters together. She then circulates, reminding the students to make the sounds of the letters to help them think of words.

Discussion: By the end of first grade, most students should have developed phonological awareness skills and instruction should focus on mapping sounds to print. Therefore, there were limited examples of explicit instruction in phonological awareness skills such as manipulating, segmenting or blending words at the phoneme or syllable level. Teachers consistently taught or reviewed letter sounds as well as letter names. The phonological awareness instruction that was observed was often embedded in other activities as in the example above. There was, however, evidence across classrooms that students had developed phonological awareness and more specifically phonemic awareness. The most common practice was the use of sound to spell observed in multiple classrooms. Students, independently or with the help of their teachers, used the sounds of letters to spell unknown words during dictation exercises, free writing, and activities to make words. Students also used their knowledge of letter sounds to decode unknown words. Finally, students demonstrated their awareness of the sounds in words in discussions, for example, the student who commented during a story discussion about a goat (*chivo*) "*Nos da leche y leche también tiene /ch/.*" (It gives us milk and the word milk also has /ch/.)

2. Understanding Text

The goal of listening and reading comprehension instruction is to teach students to use metacognitive strategies so they can regulate their understanding of text. Comprehension instruction includes activating and building background knowledge, demonstrating the importance of using strategies, and providing opportunities for discussions, retells, and rereading. Questioning before, during, and after reading contribute to understanding text. Questioning both by the teacher and self-questioning by students are effective comprehension strategies. Increasing students' vocabulary knowledge and encouraging the development of vocabulary strategies are critical for understanding text read independently. In each of these dimensions the aim is to ensure that students learn strategies they can use to monitor their understanding of what they read. In the area of Understanding Text, CETT teachers differed consistently from teachers who had not received CETT training, as may be seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Trends in Teaching Understanding of Text – Overall CETT and non-CETT

Dimension	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
-----------	---------	------------	--------------------	--------------	---------	------------

Vocabulary	CETT	14.6%	74.20%	11.2%	0	16.727**
	Non-CETT	52.0%	48.0%	0	0	
Questioning	CETT	29.2%	64.0%	6.7%	0	12.985**
	Non-CETT	68.0%	32.0%	0	0	
Comprehension	CETT	28.1%	65.2%	6.7%	0	16.391**
	Non-CETT	72.0%	28.0%	0	0	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

The majority of CETT teachers were observed to use practices that promoted the development of vocabulary, encouraged students to make inferences when responding to questions, and offered children strategies for understanding both written and oral text throughout lessons. Figure 2 exemplifies the use of questioning to activate background knowledge and prompt the discussion of text. This contrasted with non-CETT teachers, the majority of whom were not observed to focus these dimensions. It must be pointed out, however, that CETT teachers are still at a relatively low level of mastery of these instructional strategies. Only a small percentage of CETT teachers were observed to provide instruction to develop strategies that permitted students to expand vocabulary on their own, to monitor their understanding of text, or respond to questions that required analysis, synthesis and evaluation, representing more advanced practice.

Figure 2: CETT Teacher Instruction for Understanding Text

Velma is in her third year of teaching only first grade but she also taught first grade along with grades 2-6 for ten years in a one-room school. She teaches in a small rural school outside Tegucigalpa. Her lesson included discussions and questioning before and after the reading of the book.

Velma began the lesson with a discussion of the book she was going to read by asking students to comment on the cover of the book, *Sleeping Beauty*. After several students replied, she then asked them to speculate on what the title might be based on their observations. Students offered several suggestions.

Velma then read the book with expression as she walked around the room. The students were attentive. She showed the pictures after every 2 pages. After reading the story, she asked both literal and inferential questions to engage the students in a discussion of the story. For example, after asking students for the title, she asked why that was the title and students offered various responses based on the events of the story. To conclude, she asked students to offer alternative endings to the story. Students participated eagerly in the lesson.

Discussion: *Comprehension instruction includes a variety of activities that teachers can implement before, during, and after the reading of a text. The activities most often used by teachers in the project to teach comprehension included activating and building background knowledge, and incorporating discussions before and after reading the text. A few teachers were providing opportunities for retelling the story. For example, students in a classroom in Guatemala were given the opportunity to retell the story in their own words by writing, in order, everything they remembered about the story.*

Additionally, students benefit from generating and answering questions of various levels. Literal questions help them focus on the information in the text, while higher order questions extend their thinking and require that they use more elaborate language. Teachers across the sites, as in this example, have moved from using questioning as a form of assessment to using questioning as a tool for developing comprehension and for guiding discussions about texts. They are also using questions at various levels though literal questions are most often used.

Students increase their vocabulary through direct instruction and indirectly when they engage in wide reading. Through direct instruction students learn the meaning of words, differences between words with similar meanings, correct word usage, connotations, and strategies. Through wide reading students learn new words and concepts. Teachers in the study relied on direct instruction of the meaning of words to increase students' vocabulary and develop their conceptual knowledge.

3. Oral and Written Expression

Speaking, listening, and writing are addressed in this category. These elements along with reading comprise the four areas of expressive and receptive communication. Understanding written language refers to the development of an understanding of the forms and functions of print across contexts. The development of oral language skills is associated with later reading ability and with the development of vocabulary and listening comprehension in particular. Practices that help students develop oral language include participation in discussions and demonstrations, giving and following directions, listening to books read aloud, learning games, songs, and poems, activities to develop concepts, and activities to develop vocabulary. Writing instruction provides students the opportunity to apply the alphabetic principle and to use text structures and reading content. Effective writing instruction includes modeling writing strategies, the integration of the writing process in writing instruction, instruction on the use of a variety of methods for selecting writing topics and organizing ideas, providing opportunities to write for a variety of purposes and audiences, use of graphic organizers, and instruction in the mechanics of writing,

Oral and Written Expression is another area in which CETT teachers were observed to more consistently implement effective instructional practices when compared to teachers who had not received CETT training. As shown in Table 3, more than 80 percent of CETT teachers implemented practices to promote oral language development, writing skills, and the understanding of the functions of written text.

Table 3: Trends in Teaching Oral and Written Expression – CETT and non-CETT

Dimension	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
Oral Language	CETT	5.6%	51.7	36.0%	6.7%	17.315**
	Non-CETT	32.0%	56.0%	12.0%	0	
Writing	CETT	14.6%	64.0%	20.2%	1.1%	15.723**
	Non-CETT	48.0%	52.0%	0	0	
Understanding Written Language	CETT	2.2%	76.4%	20.2%	1.1%	48.475**
	Non-CETT	56.0%	44.0%	0	0	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

In the case of oral language, more than 40 percent of the CETT teachers were observed to provide students with opportunities to engage in oral language activities that develop vocabulary and different conversational formats. On the dimensions of understanding written text and writing, slightly more than 20 percent of the CETT teachers employed relevant practices. These include reading to children regularly, eliciting predictions and asking open-ended questions about the story, or providing opportunities for students to write on subjects of interest, to learn about the mechanics of writing in context, and to edit work. While around half of non-CETT teachers had begun to implement practices in these areas, such practices included repetition of sentences, dictation of words and sentences, and oral or written responses to questions associated with specific class assignments – techniques associated with a lower level of mastery of best practices than had CETT teachers. Figure 3 provides an example of a CETT teacher who engaged her students in the co-construction of a story.

Figure 3: CETT Teacher Practices in Oral and Written Expression

In her 22 years as a teacher, Elena has taught second grade four years and is in her fourth year as a first grade teacher in a large school on the outskirts of Lima.

Elena begins the lesson by inviting students to co-construct a story using words from the previous activity. She reviews the words and asks students, How do we start a story? A student says: “Once upon a time,” and identifies the main character, the trapeze artist. Students contribute to the development of the story. When students need help, Elena reviews what has been written up to that point and then asks a question to move the story forward.

When they have completed the story, Elena reads the story again, then asking students, What title would you give to the story? Students provide responses that the teacher acknowledges and writes on the board. After discussing the appropriateness of each title, she asks students to choose the best title for the story.

The class reads the story again, and then Elena asks students literal questions about the story they created. She concludes the lesson by asking students for their thoughts on the story before asking them to copy the story they have helped create.

***Discussion:** Provision of opportunities to write for a variety of purposes on a daily basis is an essential component of language arts instruction. CETT teachers across the sites provided students opportunities to engage in writing for a variety of purposes. Students wrote riddles, sentences with vocabulary words, or sentences in response to questions. With few exceptions, the writing observed was at the sentence level. The co-construction of a story, as in the example above, provides teachers with a means for modeling the writing of a story and identifying the parts and sequence of a story.*

4. Instructional Practices

CETT teachers received training in employing a range of instructional practices that promote high student engagement. These involve the use of a lesson cycle that has been associated with improved outcomes for students, using such techniques as modeling, explicit language, scaffolding, and corrective feedback. These practices provide students the instructional support they need to develop skills in an academically appropriate and supportive environment. To teach effectively, teachers should integrate assessment with instruction. The use of on-going formative evaluations and progress monitoring is critical for planning instruction that is responsive to individual students’ needs and to ensure that teachers are aware of student progress toward benchmark goals. Teachers who provide differentiated instruction create a climate in which all students are motivated and engaged in learning tasks.

As shown in Table 4, almost all CETT teachers were observed to use regularly some aspects of effective instruction. The majority of teachers incorporated some strategies such as explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice into the lesson cycle. However the use of these strategies was not consistent. When feedback was given, it was generally not focused specifically on tasks that students were attempting to carry out. However, over a third of the CETT teachers had advanced to a stage where they regularly used several of the strategies and were providing feedback that was immediate and appropriate to incorrect responses and that helped students focus on the task at hand. These teachers at times employed scaffolding in their instruction to support the students challenged with the tasks. It is interesting to note that a slight majority of the comparison group teachers also were observed to use some dimensions of effective instruction. Generally the strategies employed were the occasional use of explicit language and guided practice. Unlike the CETT teachers, however, almost a third of the comparison group did not use effective instruction strategies at all during the lessons observed.

Table 4: Trends in Employing Instructional Practices – CETT and non-CETT

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
Features of Effective Instruction	CETT	3.4%	61.8%	33.7%	1.1%	19.226**
	Non-CETT	32.0%	52.0%	16.0%	0	
Diagnostic Focus	CETT	22.5%	67.4%	9.0%	1.1%	21.614**
	Non-CETT	72.0%	24.0%	4.0%	0	
Classroom Climate	CETT	3.4%	42.7%	48.3%	5.6%	5.192
	Non-CETT	12.0%	52.0%	36.0%	0	
Differentiated Instruction	CETT	87.6%	12.4%	0	0	.226
	Non-CETT	84.0%	16.0%	0	0	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

Figure 4, below, illustrates the use of a number of the strategies of effective instruction in a Guatemalan CETT school.

Figure 4: CETT Teacher Use of Instructional Practices

Raul, a 23-year veteran teacher, was teaching first grade for the first time. He teaches in a large school in a small town in eastern Guatemala. Using a story about a fair, Raul implemented activities to build fluency and to develop vocabulary, oral language, word identification, and sentence writing. In each case he incorporated the features of effective instruction.

Raul begins this section of the lesson by informing students that he will write a sentence on the board, “At night we will see the bulls’ dance,” then proceeds to tell students they are going to talk about the word ‘night’. He asks, “What does the word ‘night’ mean to you?” Students respond by telling what they do at night or what happens. Examples of responses include, “Crickets come out at night.” Or “We see stars at night.” He approaches a student’s desk and takes a toy from a boy without interrupting instruction, then continuing the lesson. He draws a word web on the board and directs students to copy it in their notebooks. He then models how to complete the word web, asking a student for an association to night; a student provides the sentence: “The night is dark.” Raul writes “dark” on one of the lines extending from the web. He then explains the task: they are to write 8 words that describe night, writing a word on each line. As the students work, Raul circulates. When all have finished, he calls on students to provide one thing they wrote. When a student provides an answer that has been given, he tells her that it is correct but that it is already on the board. When a student provides “Holy Week,” Raul asks him to explain his thinking. When the student has difficulty, Raul explains that what he might be thinking is that there are events at night during Holy Week, especially on Friday.

Raul prepares students for the next task by providing an advance organizer for the lesson, “Now you are going to write sentences but you will work in groups.” He quickly forms groups of four by asking pairs of students to turn to face their peers behind them. He then explains the assignment. He tells them that they are going to write three sentences about the night. He then tells them that he will provide an example, “I go to the movies at night.” He then asks students to provide examples. Some students provide examples that describe the night, while other examples describe what they do at night. Before asking students to begin to work, he provides additional instructions, “If someone [in the group] gives one and it is good, everyone writes it. You will write three sentences. That is why I put you in groups of four so you could think about [the sentences].” As students work, Raul circulates and provides students with help as needed. When all the groups have finished, Raul asks a representative from each group to dictate the sentence they liked best.

Discussion: *Effective instruction gradually builds students’ knowledge and skills. Practices such as the use of explicit language, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, scaffolding and corrective feedback, provide teachers a framework for providing systematic instruction. The teacher in the example above has integrated the use of many of these practices into his instruction. He was explicit in his instruction; students knew what was expected of them. He modeled every activity for them and made sure they understood what to do before assigning independent work by soliciting examples from them and providing feedback as needed. As students began to work independently, he circulated to provide feedback or scaffold students that needed additional help.*

As with effective instruction, the vast majority of CETT teachers were observed to use strategies to promote a positive learning environment for their students. Over half of the teachers were observed to speak kindly to children and to deal with errors in positive way by asking for clarification, providing adequate wait time, and rephrasing the question when necessary. Children in these classrooms were observed to participate in classroom decisions. Other CETT teachers were less consistent in creating a positive environment. Treatment of children was likely to include ironic behavior towards children's responses and treatment of error was at times indifferent, in that teachers simply told children they were wrong or did not wait for responses. Students of those teachers were also not observed to have a voice in classroom decisions.

These types of behaviors also characterized the majority of comparison group teachers, though more than a third of these teachers had created relatively positive classroom environments. It is important to note that very few harsh and indifferent classrooms were found and no physical abuse was seen. This is consistent with general trends in education in the hemisphere to create a positive learning environment for primary school children, especially those in the early grades.

Over 75 percent of CETT teachers mentioned a diagnostic focus in determining instructional strategies to use with students. Generally, the CETT teachers used diagnostic instruments provided by CETT or the Ministry of Education and created fixed ability groups based on resulting information. There was little evidence of effort on the part of the CETT teachers to continuously assess students either formally or informally and to then adjust the learning experiences for individual students during the year.

Differentiated instruction was an area where little professional development in terms of improved practice was noted among CETT teachers. Despite efforts spent on this dimension of instructional practice in all CETT programs, teachers tended to teach the same material to all children in the same ways. In only a small percentage of the cases were teachers observed to provide different tasks to children with different needs. Such instances were distributed relatively equally among CETT and non-CETT teachers.

5. Classroom Management

Student on-task behavior during instruction is essential to improving academic outcomes. The dimensions in this category are associated with increased on-task student behavior. Effective behavior management techniques create a classroom environment of mutual respect and shared expectations, both behavioral and academic. The use of flexible grouping formats is an effective method for targeting and differentiating instruction and providing students multiple opportunities to practice new skills. Likewise, the effective use of time and physical space can increase student engagement and decrease off-task behavior.

In slightly more than 60 percent of the observations, CETT teachers were found to be using grouping strategies. However, these strategies were often organizational in nature and teachers still tended to teach to the whole class during group sessions. During group activities, students were generally assigned the same task but each group developed its own product, such as a written story. In many instances, considerable time was needed in selecting and forming groups. Over half of the comparison teachers and 39 percent of CETT teachers used only a whole class format.

Similarly, over half of CETT and 76 percent of the comparison group teachers used time ineffectively. There were no opening activities that engaged students when they arrived in class, or when they finished a task, and transitions between activities involved considerable time in assembling materials, handing out books, or regrouping. The comparison of CETT and non-CETT teachers along these dimensions is shown in Table 5 below. Those teachers who had developed strategies for transitions generally allowed children who had completed their work to read books from the reading areas encouraged by CETT.

Table 5: Trends in Classroom Management – CETT and non-CETT

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
Grouping	CETT	39.2%	49.4%	12.4%	0	3.131
	Non-CETT	56.0%	40.0%	4.0%	0	
Behavior Management	CETT	5.6%	49.4%	34.8%	7.9%	14.236**
	Non-CETT	28.0%	56.0%	16.0%	0	
Physical Space	CETT	7.9%	75.3%	15.7%	1.1%	26.783**
	Non-CETT	52.0%	44.0%	4.0%	0	
Use of Time	CETT	55.1%	31.5%	13.5%	0	5.170
	Non-CETT	76.0%	24.0%	0	0	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

Effective behavior management is important for establishing a classroom climate that fosters student learning. Over 90 percent of CETT teachers, and over half of non-CETT teachers, had made rules that were stated positively. However, in about half of both CETT and non-CETT classes with such rules, the consequences for not following the rules were unclear and enforced inconsistently. In the remaining classes with explicit rules, such rules were posted and students were reminded of the rules regularly. Enforcement of the rules was consistent and consequences appropriate. Figure 5 illustrates teacher classroom management techniques across the CETTs.

Figure 5: CETT Teacher Use of Classroom Management Techniques

CETT Teachers used a variety of behavior management strategies. In classrooms where rules were posted, teachers often reminded students of the rules at the beginning of the day and throughout the lesson as needed. Some teachers used positive reinforcement to increase on-task behavior, such as awarding points to groups that followed the rules and completed their work. Other teachers did not post the rules but it was obvious that students were aware of the expectations. When a student failed to follow a rule, for example when a student was kneeling in his chair, the teacher asked the class to recite the rule about sitting in chairs and all the students responded.

Discussion: *The most common behavior management practice was the use of “dinámicas,” song and movement activities, meant to motivate, redirect, or calm students between activities. Based on the premise that young students should not sit for long periods of time and that punishing students is harmful, some teachers would stop instruction whenever students became restless, too loud, or distracted, to sing a song. Though students seemed to enjoy the activity, it was not always effective since teachers sometimes had to interrupt instruction repeatedly to engage students. Teachers did not always indicate to students why they had stopped instruction. The use of clear and explicit rules as in the examples above were less common but represent a more appropriate approach to behavior management that makes behavior expectations clear to students.*

Teachers seemed to understand the importance of student engagement. A teacher stated that she reminds students often that they have to listen to her when she talks because they can only learn when they listen. However, across the CETTs there was a frequent lack of effective behavior management, thus many students were often off-task rather than engaged in learning activities. Many of the students that were off-task engaged in distracting behaviors such as banging on desks, making unnecessary noise, throwing paper and other objects, hitting each other, taking things from each other, and sometimes running around the room. Other students who were off-task sat at their desks and were engaged in other activities or sat quietly but did not participate. Most teachers ignored these behaviors and continued instruction or interrupted instruction with a “dinámica” when the classroom got too noisy. Another teacher behavior that contributed to ineffective behavior management was the use of threats of inappropriate consequences such as telling students they would not get snacks. Teachers frequently cited rules and then ignored them. For example, a commonly observed practice was for teachers to tell children to raise their hands if they wished to speak, but then to accept responses from anyone who called out.

It should be noted that the ineffective use of time was frequently linked to problems with behavior management, since many students did not have anything to do while a single student was at the blackboard, or when they had completed their work and were expected to sit and wait for the others to finish. In such situations they often engaged in the types of disruptive behaviors mentioned above.

As with the creation of rules for behavior management, over 90 percent of the CETT teachers were observed to have developed strategies for dealing with available physical space. In the majority of the cases these strategies related to the flexible use of seating arrangements in limited space, or to the creation of displays of children’s work and interest centers (such as reading corners) where children could engage in independent activities. These were created by 71.9 percent of CETT teachers. Also, most CETT teachers had made notable efforts to provide a text-rich environment in their classrooms, many using posters provided by the CETT as well as teacher-made charts; 78.8 percent of CETT teachers stated that they changed these displays frequently. Among the principal limits in utilizing physical space, especially in the Andean countries, was that classrooms were shared between morning and afternoon (and sometimes evening) sessions in the same space. Thus, materials had to be put away at the end of every school day so that the class entering the classroom in the subsequent session had access to its own materials. In contrast to the CETT teachers, the majority of teachers in comparison schools were observed to teach in classrooms with out any learning centers or displays of student work.

6. Reflective Practice

Teacher change is at the core of instructional reform. The dimensions in this category serve as indicators that teachers are changing their practice. Teachers that reflect on their practice, self-

evaluate their teaching, and can discuss what and how they are changing can be proactive in identifying areas for further growth. As teachers increase their knowledge of teaching reading they are able to use materials flexibly to meet the needs of students.

Most of the CETT teachers expressed ideas and opinions, indicating that they reflect on their teaching practice. A majority of the CETT teachers had come to question established practice or the traditional way in which they had taught in the past. However, they were not familiar with a wide variety of instructional practices and were generally comfortable to rely on the guidance of CETT for establishing new practice. About a fourth, however, had familiarity with several strategies and were able to articulate how such different strategies could serve the different learning needs of students. Table 6, below, illustrates the degree to which CETT teachers are reflective about their practice, compared to teachers in the comparison schools.

Table 6: Reflective Practice in Teaching – CETT and non-CETT

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
Reflection	CETT	4.5%	68.5%	24.7%	2.2%	25.216**
	Non-CETT	40.0%	56.0%	4.0%	0	
Works with Others	CETT	2.2%	89.9%	5.6%	2.2%	4.968
	Non-CETT	12.0%	84.0%	4.0%	0	
Use of Materials	CETT	49.4%	43.8%	6.7%	0	4.723
	Non-CETT	72.0%	28.0%	0	0	

* significant at $\chi^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $\chi^2 \leq .01$

Over 40 percent of the comparison group was content to rely on practices provided to them by others such as ministries of education or commercial publishers or pedagogical institutes, while CETT teachers tended to have a more reflective understanding of their methods and their own learning. They also demonstrated, to some degree, an understanding of more adept and confident use of reading materials, including complementary materials. While most comparison teachers were observed to use only the blackboard and occasionally texts in a sequential, page-by-page fashion, with little variation, and with no supplementary materials, over half of CETT teachers did introduce supplementary materials, primarily through interest centers to complement the blackboard and existing texts.

In Figure 6, excerpts from an interview exemplify the manner in which a CETT teacher from Honduras talked about her practice and the changes she has made as a result of her participation in the project.

Figure 6: CETT Teacher Use of Reflective Practice

Monica is a licensed teacher in a large, urban school in Honduras. She has been at this school 19 years, 9 of those in 1st grade. In her interview, Monica reflected on her practice and the impact the project has had on her teaching.

Monica identified her teaching priority as integrating the basic competencies in reading and writing to develop students who read, write, and comprehend and are competent in every aspect, not by rote but in a way that will teach them to think critically.

When asked to identify the best teaching method, she named several approaches such as analytic, synthetic, phonetic, and whole word and explained that since they all have strengths and weaknesses, she uses a combination: “The best is a combination, one supports the other- you have to relate them to each other. I rely on everything.” She went on to explain that students have different needs—you have to consider the number of students and the age of students as well as their ability levels, so the more methods you know the more you have to draw from.

In describing the lesson that had been observed, Monica spoke often of meeting students needs. She stated that one has to pay attention to students, that although initially the manual activities seemed repetitive she realized that the repetition gives students with difficulty more opportunities to learn. In planning her lessons, she explained, she looked for activities that targeted the objective and also those that provided practice in areas where students were still having difficulty.

Finally, in discussing the changes in her practice, Monica acknowledged that she had not taught this way before but she wants to improve: to change from the traditional method. She also wants the best for her students and wants fewer students retained. She feels she will achieve this by taking advantage all the available techniques. She wants to improve her teaching by using more effective practices, taking time to really understand the new methods.

Discussion: *Reflecting on one’s practice is an important first step in teacher change and it is vital for sustainable change. Change requires critical evaluation of one’s teaching, knowledge of instructional methods, a means for assessing student progress to evaluate the efficacy of new practices, and constructive feedback. Teachers across the CETT sites have begun to engage in this process as evidenced by their comments during interviews. Like Monica, many spoke of leaving traditional practices behind because of the changes they had seen in their students. Though many admitted that they had not been initially convinced of the efficacy of the new methods, very few remained unconvinced at the end of the year. Another important factor cited by the teachers was the ongoing support they receive from the trainers and the opportunities to share experiences with other teachers in study circles.*

Another part of the CETT training methodology involved encouraging teachers to communicate and share experiences, to seek help from the trainers but also from one another. CETT and non-CETT teachers were similar in the strategies employed to seek help from others. Almost all did seek help in planning or resolving problems through regular meetings with other teachers of the same grade in large schools. In smaller schools, regular meetings were held with the entire teaching staff. Outside of the CETT training, teachers had had little opportunity to observe other teachers giving classes or in obtaining reference materials from other sources. However, as part of CETT training, the teacher circles (found in each CETT but with slightly differing names and formats) offered a professional forum in which this reflection and ongoing assessment was actively taking place. Non-CETT teachers reported engaging in such discussions only rarely, and usually with a particular purpose, such as annual planning or disciplinary problems – not in terms of ongoing professional development.

7. Parental Involvement

Strategies for involving parents and the local educational community in student learning activities were similar for CETT and non-CETT teachers. Strategies consisted principally of sending notes to parents about official meetings or the progress of their children. In Table 7, below, the slight differences between CETT and non-CETT schools are shown.

Parents are generally aware of the CETTs and a majority of principals and teachers described parents' reactions to the CETTs as generally very positive. Several of those commented that there had been difficulty with some parents initially because the methodology was different from what they were accustomed to, but that attitudes had changed during the year. Teachers credited this change in part to their own efforts to inform parents about the new program and its benefits. Teachers also credited the uncommon successes their students were having: these successes had allayed many parents' initial concerns. Parents who had had older children pass through the same school setting were said to have commented on the difference as well.

Few teachers reported encouraging parents to visit or assist in class, and teachers asserted that most parents did not help with homework. This lack of help was generally attributed to the low educational level of the parents. However, engaging parents with school and literacy issues has been shown to boost student interest and confidence. Even when parents themselves do not read, there are efforts they can make to help their children learn, such as having the children read to them, or to younger siblings.

Table 7: Parental Involvement – CETT and non-CETT

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery	Chi Square
Community Relations	CETT	3.4%	80.9%	13.5%	2.2%	.639
	Non-CETT	4.0%	84.0%	12.0%	0	

* significant at $x^2 \leq .05$; ** significant at $x^2 \leq .01$

8. Gender Differences

The trends in professional development for female teachers differed little from the overall trends. This is to be expected, as women made up 88 percent of the study sample. Thus, in terms of reading and writing instruction female CETT teachers had significantly greater development in the areas of phonological awareness, oral language, writing, understanding written language, vocabulary, questioning, and comprehension than female teachers in the comparison group. Similarly, CETT teachers exhibited greater development in the areas of effective instruction, diagnostic practice, behavior management, use of physical space and reflection about teaching practice. Male CETT teachers had generally similar distributions to female CETT teachers. However, because of the small number of male teachers, significant differences with the comparison group were found only in understanding written language, questioning, comprehension, effective instruction, classroom climate, and use of physical space. It is interesting to note that in the dimension of phonological awareness 70 percent of the male CETT teachers did not use these strategies. This compares to only 24 percent at this level among female CETT teachers.

9. Student Attendance

As an indication of the effect of the CETT teachers' instructional strategies on student interest in attending school, attendance was calculated for the day of the observation by gender. The number of children present during the observation was counted and compared to the overall number of children enrolled in the class. Table 8 shows the average daily attendance percentage at CETT and comparison schools across all countries. As can be seen, CETT attendance was consistently higher than that of comparison schools, with the largest difference of more than four

percentage points occurring between CETT and non-CETT female students. However, because of the sample size, the differences can not be said to be conclusive.

Table 8: Average Single Day Attendance of CETT and non-CETT Students

Group	Average Attendance
Girls CETT	86.8%
Girls non-CETT	82.1%
Boys CETT	82.4%
Boys non-CETT	80.1
Overall CETT	83.7%
Overall non-CETT	82.2%

B. Factors Contributing to Implementation of Successful Practices

Aspects of the teachers' past experience, such as overall teaching experience, experience teaching first grade and academic experience, were examined in relation to their professional practice. In addition, differences in teachers' CETT experience in terms of the amount of training and follow-up received and their general acceptance of or motivation in implementing the program were also studied. As school-level implementation is examined separately (Section IV.E, below), the only school-level variables used in relation to individual teacher professional development were principals' experience and the support teachers said their principals provided them individually.

1. Overall Teacher Experience

Teacher experience was examined in terms of the total number of years of classroom teaching experience that teachers had completed, as well as the number of years teaching first grade. In general, experience had very little relation to levels of professional development achieved by CETT teachers. On 19 of the 21 dimensions studied, the distribution of teachers with more than ten years of experience was similar to that of teachers with less than five years of experience and those with between five and ten years of experience. The exceptions were differentiated instruction and behavior management. With the dimension of differentiated instruction, all of the teachers exhibited behavior that was at the first two levels of professional development. However, 41.8 percent of teachers with less than five years of experience were at the second level, which we have called "form without substance." This compares to no teachers at this level in the five to ten years of experience group and 8.6 percent of the teachers with the most experience. With behavior management, each of the three groups had more than 40 percent of their teachers at near mastery and mastery levels. However, 25 percent of the teachers with the least years of experience were at the mastery level, compared to 11.8 percent for the group with five to ten years of experience and 3.4 percent for the group with more than ten years experience, resulting in a significant difference in the distributions of the three groups.

Previous experience with first grade did not seem to facilitate professional development of CETT first grade teachers. No differences in the distributions of teachers on the levels of professional development were found, whether a teacher had one year or less of first grade teaching experience, two to five years, six to ten years, or more than 11 years of experience. Because so many highly subjective factors cut across age groups to influence teacher willingness and ability

to change – among them their training, experiences and attitudes – more study would be needed to determine the reasons for these varying levels of success.

2. Amount of Training

As amount of training varied by program and by teachers' ability to participate in all CETT training events, teachers were asked to estimate the number of days of CETT training that they had received. Days were converted to weeks for consistency of analysis. Amount of training had a relatively strong relationship with professional development. As can be seen in Table 9, there was a consistent trend toward higher percentages of teachers with more CETT training at higher levels of professional development. Although the percentage change is small, with each additional week of training there is a small percentage drop in the first two levels of professional development and an increase in the combined percentage total of the higher two levels.

When individual elements of professional development were analyzed, significant differences were found favoring higher levels of training on Understanding of Written Language and Vocabulary Development. Comprehension, Organization of Physical Space and Diagnostic focus also tended toward significance ($\chi^2 \leq .1$), with results favoring greater amounts of training. The exception was Community Relations where 66.7 percent of the teachers who said they had had one week of training were at the near mastery level and 22 percent of the teachers with two weeks of training were at the same level. Thus, this dimension of professional practice was highly significant in terms of the distribution of teachers with lower amounts of training. This would seem to suggest that factors not requiring extensive training are related to successful professional development in this area.

Table 9: Overall Trends in Amount of Training - CETT Teachers

Amount of Training	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery
One Week	42.8%	50.7%	6.3%	0
Two Weeks	23.8%	56.2%	17.6%	2.2%
Three Weeks	19.5%	57.8%	21.3%	1.4%
Four or More Weeks	21.3%	55.2%	21.7%	1.2%

3. Training Follow-up

Teachers identified the frequency with which they received follow-up to training events, either at their own schools or with colleagues from other schools at a local center. The frequency of follow-up did not provide consistent trends related to the professional development of individual teachers. As can be seen from Table 10, those teachers who said that they had weekly follow-up produced the lowest percentage of overall professional development at the two higher levels. The other three groups of teachers had similar percentages of teachers at those levels.

Table 10: Overall Trends in Frequency of Follow-up - CETT Teachers

Frequency of Follow-Up	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery
One Week	26.3%	58.9%	12.8%	1.4%
Two Weeks	20.1%	58.2%	20.56%	1.4%
One Month	23.2%	55.9%	19.6%	1.2%
Two Months	21.4%	56.3%	18.6%	3.9%

It might be surmised that trainers visited those teachers who had difficulty implementing the program more frequently. Indeed, many trainers and coordinators stated in their interviews that they spent more time with teachers who needed more assistance.

4. Teachers' Views on Usefulness of Training

The usefulness of the training received by teachers was examined in two ways. First, teachers were asked directly what had been the most useful aspect of the training for their teaching of students. Table 11 shows that there were a variety of responses to this question. The response voiced by the highest percentage of teachers (20%) was that all of the training had been useful. This response was followed by phonological awareness and production of texts, named by 13.5 percent and 11.2 percent of teachers, respectively.

When responses were grouped by content area, a variety of answers related to classroom climate, behavior management, and planning had 23.4 percent of the responses. Dimensions of the teaching of reading, including phonological awareness and comprehension, followed with slightly more than 20 percent. The teaching of writing, identified exclusively as production of texts, and use/availability of instructional materials were each mentioned by 11.2 percent of CETT teachers. Other unspecified responses, such as "yes" or "integration," together with "no response" made up the remaining percentage.

Table 11: Useful Aspects of Training – CETT Teachers

Area Identified	Percentage of responses
Reading	20.2%
-Phonological Awareness	13.5%
-Reading Comprehension	4.5%
-Phonics	2.2%
Climate/Management	23.4%
-Variety of Activities/Strategies	10.1%
-Teach Students to be Active	4.5%
-Being Tender with Students	2.2%
-Class Management	2.2%
-Preparation	2.2%
-Grouping	1.1%
-More Tolerant of Errors	1.1%
Writing	11.2%
-Production of Texts	11.2%
Materials	11.2%
-Instructional Materials	7.8%
-Make Materials	3.4%
All	20.2%
Other	13.8%

Teachers were also asked what changes they had actually made in their teaching as a result of training. On this question, they were somewhat more specific in identifying the practices used in different areas of instruction. Table 12 shows that reading instruction was the area where the greatest number of teachers made changes in their practice. Overall, 39.7 percent of the teachers mentioned changes in reading practice. By far the most significant change was teaching phonological awareness, which was mentioned by slightly more than a third of the CETT

teachers. A number of changes in classroom climate and management strategies were also mentioned. Responses in this area made up 36.1 percent of the total. Writing and use of materials made up an additional 16.9 percent of the responses.

Table 12: Change in Practice as a Result of Training – CETT Teachers

Area Identified	Percentage of responses
Reading	39.7%
-Teach Phonological Awareness	33.7%
-Read more/reading schedule	3.6%
-Use Stories	1.2%
-Students Make Predictions	1.2%
Climate/Management	36.1%
-Use More Activities/Strategies	14.5%
-Teach Students to be Active	10.8%
-Hands-on, focus on Children	4.8%
-More Accepting	4.8%
-Manage Class Better	1.2%
Writing	12.0%
-Create Texts	8.4%
-Students do less copying	3.6%
Materials	4.8%
-Use More Materials	3.6%
-Make Materials	1.2%
No Change	2.4%
Other	5.0%

5. Teachers' Pedagogical Approaches

In order to determine how teachers felt they were applying the identified changes brought about by participation in the CETT training, teachers were asked to describe their pedagogical approach to teaching. As can be seen in Table 13, responses reflect those given in terms of usefulness of training and changes in teaching. The greatest number of teachers stated that they used a combination of methods that generally included at least phonological awareness and phonics. Phonological awareness was the second-most cited approach. This was followed by active teaching methods, employing examples and vocabulary from students' own reality, creating texts, and using stories. All of these techniques form part of the CETT training package in each country. The remaining approaches were generally mentioned by a single individual or could not be clearly interpreted.

Table 13: CETT Teacher Pedagogical Approaches

Approach	Percentage of responses
Combination	30.6%
Phonological Awareness	22.4%
Active Learning	11.8%
Reality of the Students	9.4%
Create Texts	7.1%
Stories	4.7%
General to Specific	1.2%
Global	1.2%
Other	11.6%

6. Teacher Motivation

Commitment to an innovation has long been associated with successful adoption of the innovation and eventual mastery. In order to measure teacher commitment to implementing the training of the CETT program, ratings of teachers were received from trainers in terms of motivation in training and follow-up activities. These ratings were then examined in relation to the dimensions of professional development studied. Teacher motivation had little effect on professional development. On 20 of the 21 dimensions studied no differences were found among teachers with “excellent,” “medium,” or “low” ratings. The single exception was the dimension of writing, where teachers rated as “excellent” had 50 percent of teachers at the mastery and near mastery levels, compared to 19.2 percent for the “medium” group and 5.6 percent for the “low” group.

7. Principal Experience and Support

Leadership within a school is generally considered an important element of acceptance and mastery of an innovation by teachers. Two aspects of leadership – the principal’s years of experience as a school director, and support provided by principals, as identified by teachers – were examined in terms of teachers’ professional development. Principals’ experience in leading a school seems to have little relationship to individual teachers’ professional development in CETT. On 19 of the 21 dimensions, no differences were found among teachers with principals with one year or less of experience, teachers with principals with two to five years experience, and teachers with principals with more than six years of experience.

Teachers with the least experienced principals were favored on the dimensions of questioning techniques and use of time. On use of time, 72 percent of the teachers with inexperienced principals were above the initiating level of professional development, whereas 61.5 percent and 62.5 percent of the teachers with more experienced principals were at this initial level. With questioning techniques, 27.3 percent of the teachers with inexperienced principals were at the near mastery level compared to 0 percent and 3.1 percent of the other two groups.

It might be assumed that principals that were new to the job would be highly motivated and thereby motivate their teachers, accounting for higher levels of professional development. However, when principals were compared in terms of CETT trainer ratings of the overall school motivation, no difference was found among principals in terms of length of service. Similarly, no differences were found in professional development levels of those teachers who said that they received support primarily from their principal when such teachers were compared to teachers who said that they received support from supervisors or other sources.

C. Obstacles to the Implementation of Successful Practices

Obstacles to the successful implementation of an innovation include contextual variables such as the well-being of the students served, the physical condition of the learning center and the type of learning situation. System level conditions such as strikes and non-payment of wages can also affect implementation. Within the classroom, lack of materials, student absenteeism, and lack of parental cooperation may influence implementation. In this section, student socio-economic status, school size, location, and type of learning situation are examined in relation to

professional development. The principal obstacles to implementation identified by CETT teachers and their recommendations for improving the CETT program are also detailed.

1. Student Socio-Economic Status

Teachers identified the socio-economic status of their students. The majority of the CETT students (62%) were classified as “working class” which was defined by teachers as agriculture, factory work, or work as domestics. Those classified as “poor” made up the next largest percentage (34%). The remaining teachers (4%) classified their students as either “lower middle” or “middle class.” No meaningful differences were found in terms of socio-economic status when teachers’ professional development within CETT was compared.

2. School Size

School size appeared to be unrelated to the professional development of individual CETT teachers. No differences were found among teachers on any of the 21 dimensions studied whether they were the only first grade teacher in a school, had one first grade colleague or had two or more colleagues.

3. School Location

Location of schools in an urban center or a rural area was also contrasted. Location generally had little effect on teacher professional development. On 20 of the 21 dimensions of good practice, no differences were found among teachers in urban and rural schools. The exception was with phonological awareness, where 61.1 percent of the rural teachers were at the near mastery level compared to 39.4 percent of urban teachers. Also, only 5.6 percent of rural CETT teachers remained at the lowest level of professional development in phonological awareness, compared to 35.2 percent of the CETT urban teachers. Evaluators were not able to identify possible reasons for this anomaly; however, by bringing it to the attention of the CETTs, the study team hoped CETT staff may recognize some reason behind the difference.

4. School Type

Differences in classroom arrangement, that is, whether a school was organized in single grades or had multi-grade classrooms in first grade, were also examined. No differences were found between teachers in multi-grade classrooms and those in graded classrooms in terms of their levels of professional development.

5. Teacher-Identified Difficulties in Implementation

Teachers were asked to identify obstacles to successfully implementing the training that they had received from CETT. Two types of difficulties were identified: elements of the training program that were hard to implement, and contextual obstacles. Table 14 summarizes the pedagogical obstacles to implementing the CETT training. As can be seen, a relatively large percentage of teachers (21.6 %) stated that they had no difficulty in implementing their CETT training. A similar percentage identified some aspect of reading as being difficult to implement. Classroom management and general teacher capabilities, ranging from lack of parent participation to teachers’ inability to draw, made up 16.9 percent of the responses. Writing, especially teaching students to produce and edit texts was identified by 14.7 percent of respondents. Similar percentages of teachers identified lack of materials and lack of understanding of evaluation as difficulties.

A small number of the CETT teachers mentioned contextual issues in addition to the pedagogical ones displayed in Table 14. These included: lack of space or problems of sharing space (3.4%); lack of materials (2.2%); and training on weekends (1.1%).

Table 14: Teacher Identified Obstacles to Implementation

Area of Difficulty	Percentage of Responses
No Problems	21.6%
Reading	21.5%
-Phonemes	10.2%
-Student Reading Book	3.2%
-Use of Questions	3.2%
-Student Reading	1.1%
-Use Gestures	1.1%
Climate/Management	16.9%
-Lack of Parent Participation	5.7%
-Planning	3.4%
-Need More Time	2.3%
-Learning Centers	1.1%
-Songs	1.1%
Competencies	1.1%
Drawing	1.1%
Individual Attention	1.1%
Writing	14.7%
-Student Writing-Folders	5.7%
-Integration of Subjects	4.5%
-Written Expression	3.4%
-Student Editing	1.1%
Evaluation	7.9%
-Evaluation Techniques	6.8%
-Test Battery	1.1%
Materials	7.8%
-Lack of Didactic Material	3.4%
-Lack of Student Texts	2.2%
-Don't Understand Manual	1.1%
-Need Computer Awareness	1.1%
No Response	9.1%

6. Teacher-Identified Training Needs

Teachers were asked about areas in which they felt that they could benefit from additional training. Table 15 summarizes the 74 percent of responses where there was more than a single answer. As can be seen, a number of teachers recognize that they have not yet mastered dimensions of teaching such as phonological awareness and writing, as more than 10 percent of the sample identified each of these areas. Similarly the need to differentiate instruction was recognized by those teachers that believed that more training in children's learning difficulties and evaluation are needed. Greater integration of subject matter and training in mathematics were also identified by several teachers. A relatively large percentage of teachers (12.5%) asked for more of the same type of training as CETT had provided in the previous year. Only 4.5 percent of teachers thought that they didn't need any more training.

Table 15: Teacher Identified Areas for Additional Training

Area for Further Training	Percent of Responses
Phonological Awareness	13.6%
Writing	10.2%
Evaluation	8.0%
Children's Learning Difficulties	8.0%
Comprehension	6.8%
Mathematics	5.7%
Integration with Other Subjects	4.5%
More of the Same	12.5%
No More Training	4.5%

7. Teacher Suggestions for Improving CETT

Teachers' suggestions for improving CETT, outlined in Table 16 below, were related primarily to the training itself and to the materials used in training. Almost 30 percent of the teachers suggested that training should be continued beyond the initial year. About a quarter of the teachers had suggestions in terms of materials. These suggestions dealt principally with the need for additional training materials or more timely presentation of available materials. Twelve percent of the respondents addressed the training context, with most of these focusing on the need for more demonstrations, especially in classrooms. Some respondents felt that the training structure should be altered to include all primary grades, and a few wanted changes in the training schedule. About 14 percent of the responses requested financial aid for teachers or better communication about the training schedule. Eight percent of the teachers felt that no improvements in the CETT program were needed.

Table 16: Teacher Suggestions for Improving CETT

Suggestion	Percent of Responses
Training Duration	28.4%
-Continue Another Year	20.4%
-More Training	8.0%
Training Materials	22.6%
-Provide More Materials	11.4%
-Provide Materials Earlier	5.7%
-Provide Texts	2.3%
-More reading Materials	1.1%
-Tapes for Phonemes	1.1%
Training Context	12.4%
-More Demonstrations	9.1%
-Include Math	1.1%
-Individualized Instruction	1.1%
-Visit Other Countries	1.1%
Training Structure	8.9%
-Provide to All Primary	4.5%
-Train during the Day	2.3%
-Train during Vacation	1.1%
No suggestion	8.0%
Other	6.1%
No Response	13.6%

D. Subregional Variation in the Implementation of Successful Practices

To identify implementation of successful practices by subregion, successful practices were defined as those practices in which at least 25 percent of CETT teachers and less than 25 percent of non-CETT teachers were at near mastery or mastery and there were significant differences between CETT and non-CETT teachers. Teachers who are near mastery in a dimension or dimensions demonstrate improved form and substance in implementing new or enhanced practices and have developed a more sophisticated understanding of the teaching of literacy. Teachers at this level can serve as mentors for their peers. Teachers at the mastery level have internalized the practice and implement the practice consistently. Their mentorship aptitude is very high, and they can become leaders in the field. This section highlights those areas in which CETT teachers in a subregion have reached this inclusion criteria, that is, at least a quarter are at near mastery or mastery, and no more than a quarter of non-CETT teachers are at those levels. This data may be used to inform future exchange between the CETTs, and mutual learning.

1. Andean CETT Successful Practices

The Andean CETT teachers had consistently higher percentages at higher levels of professional development than the comparison group on all dimensions of the study. On 10 of the 21 dimensions, the difference was statistically significant. And on five of those dimensions, CETT teachers met the mastery/near mastery criteria described above (shown in Table 17, below): two dimensions of reading instruction and three dimensions of instructional practice. Over 40 percent of the teachers were implementing phonological awareness and oral language instruction well. Teachers at this level taught phonological awareness explicitly and in the context of other instruction. They taught and used the sounds of letters rather than letter names in their instruction. They prompted students to use their knowledge of the sounds of letters to spell and sound out words and students were observed using this strategy independently and to help peers. As an example, during a lesson a student misspelled “*toalla*” as “*tualla*.” Some students noticed it was wrong. The teacher took the opportunity to tell students that while the word is often pronounced “*tualla*,” the word was spelled “*toalla*.” She then guided the student through the use of prompts to correct the word.

Teachers in CETT classrooms provided students multiple opportunities to use oral language in both structured and unstructured formats. Students participated in discussions to develop concepts and vocabulary, listened to and discussed texts read aloud, learned songs and poems. Students were active participants during instruction, answering and posing questions, providing opinions, and initiating discussions. On the dimension of effective instruction, teachers using these techniques consistently used explicit language and modeling to introduce new concepts and skills. They also scaffolded student learning by providing corrective and specific feedback.

Table 17: Andean CETT Successful Practices

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery
Phonological Awareness	CETT	29.2%	27.0%	43.8%	0
	Non-CETT	56.0%	36.0%	8.0%	0
Oral Language	CETT	5.6%	51.7	36.0%	6.7%
	Non-CETT	32.0%	56.0%	12.0%	0
Features of Effective Instruction	CETT	3.4%	61.8%	33.7%	1.1%
	Non-CETT	72.0%	24.0%	4.0%	0
Behavior Management	CETT	5.6%	49.4%	34.8%	7.9%

	Non-CETT	28.0%	56.0%	16.0%	0
Reflection	CETT	4.5%	68.5%	24.7%	2.2%
	Non-CETT	40.0%	56.0%	4.0%	0

Teachers at the near mastery and mastery level employed behavior management practices such as the use of posted rules, regular reviews of the rules, a shared set of behavioral expectations, and explicit and appropriate consequences for misbehavior. Students in these classrooms tended to be more engaged in instruction and less off-task behavior was observed.

Teachers in the Andean CETT identified various approaches to teaching reading and demonstrated an awareness of the strengths of each. They also spoke of the relative efficacy of various approaches for different students. This illustrates a growing knowledge base and greater reflection on the part of these teachers.

2. Caribbean CETT Successful Practices

As the Reflective Study in the Caribbean was a pilot study, and because the sample size was very small (11 teachers in 7 schools), it was more difficult for the study team to identify dimensions in which the Caribbean CETT teachers were significantly better than their comparison counterparts. Simply because of sample size, the statistical significance of differences was harder to substantiate; however, there were positive findings that are important to detail here.

The Caribbean CETT teachers had consistently higher percentages at higher levels of professional development than the comparison group on 14 of the 21 dimensions of the study. On one of the dimensions, the difference was found to be statistically significant. Teachers in the Caribbean CETT met the mastery inclusion criteria cited above in two dimensions, understanding written language and reflection. They implemented practices that helped students understand the forms and functions of books. Teachers read to students using big books and encouraged discussions about the books. They also provided reading centers in their classrooms that students used to read independently. Teachers in the Caribbean were able to identify an educational philosophy and discuss why they used various instructional strategies. They were also able to articulate goals for their own continued growth. Table 18 presents Caribbean CETT Successful Practices.

Table 18: Caribbean CETT Successful Practices

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery
Understanding Written Language	CETT	0	75.0%	25.0%	0
	Non-CETT	66.7%	33.3%	0	0
Reflection	CETT	0	75.0%	25.0%	0
	Non-CETT	66.7%	33.3%	0	0

For many CETT teachers the idea of reading aloud regularly to children was a new concept. Reading aloud not only helps children enjoy books and become motivated to read, but discussion of words in the story builds vocabulary, and use of predictions and discussion about the story helps develop oral expression and comprehension. Figure 7 provides a sample of a read aloud lesson.

Figure 7: CETT Teacher Developing Understanding of the Purposes of Written Language

Natasha is a teacher in a large school in a town in the countryside in Jamaica. She has taught for 22 years, mostly in grades 1, 2 and 3. Her classroom is text-rich, with displays of word charts, stories, a “grocery shop” with labeled food cartons, a reading corner and ample displays of children’s work.

A Big Book about apples is ready on an easel. The teacher holds up several real apples, asking children what they’re called, where they have seen apples before, where these apples might be from. Students suggest “United States,” and she agrees. She holds up different apples and asks where those might be from. Students: “Jamaica.” Teacher discusses with children how they know, and what these apples are called. Student: “Jamaican apples.” “Yes, these are our Jamaican apples. Why do we call them Jamaican?” Student calls out, “Because they grow on a tree.”

Teacher: “But those others grow on a tree too.” Student: “From Jamaica.” Teacher: “Yes, we call them Jamaican because they grow in Jamaica.” They discuss characteristics of different apples. She says, “I am going to read you a story, but first let’s talk about some words” She asks if they have seen an apple tree. Students respond enthusiastically, telling about apple trees. She holds up a real apple tree branch that has leaves, a bud and an apple blossom on it. They discuss the bud, flower, apple. Shows them an actual bud. “Anyone like to spell this?” Student “B-A-D.” T- “OK,” writes it “bud” on board. “This time it’s a U.” “A bud turns into a flower. What you call this?” (holds up an apple blossom). Provides word herself: “This is a blossom.” Writes “blossom” on board. Fingers the parts of the blossom. “What do you call these?” Student: “leaves.” “Very good. The leaves are the petals.”

Teacher: “Now for our story.” She holds up the Big Book, saying, “Anyone can tell me what the story will be about?” She makes web on the board, using their responses: “apples,” “little girl” and “apple tree.” She says, “We’re going to read and find out at the end of the story if that’s what it was about.” Mentions title, author and “the person who drew the pictures”. Reads and shows picture. “I am a red bud.” Picture shows red bird on branch that has red bud. “What is a bud? Student: “A little flower” Teacher: “Okay, the bud is the part that will turn into a flower.” Asks boy to come and show her the bud. He comes up and points to the bird. Teacher: “Yes, we call this (pointing to bird) a bud too. Who can tell me how we write this?” Tells them, “b-i-r-d.” “We call this bud, but what is the right word for it?” “BIRD (stressing the /ir/sound).” Has them all repeat it. As she reads the story, she stops and asks questions and also refers again to the real branch, bud and blossoms. She asks some children to come up and point out the real items and then the pictures of the items in the story.

Discussion: *Children from environments in which adults do little or no reading and writing and where there may be no books need particular assistance in developing concepts about what written language is and what it is used for. The teacher above is helping children develop their understanding of the uses of written language by providing a text-rich classroom and by providing experiences to help the children connect their own world to the world of print. The children see their own words written down, can feel an apple and learn that an apple can be shown in a picture or its name printed in a book. Not only must children in the Caribbean deal with the complexities of English vowels, but most of them are learning Standard English as a second language, as they speak Creole at home. This teacher is helping them connect their language with that used in school and in books.*

3. CETT Central America–Dominican Republic Successful Practices

The CETT Central America – Dominican Republic (CETT CA-RD) teachers had consistently higher percentages at higher levels of professional development than the comparison group on 20 of 21 dimensions of the study. CETT teacher ratings were higher to a statistically significant degree on 12 of the 21 dimensions. Teachers in the CETT CA-RD met mastery criteria in three dimensions, two reading dimensions and one instructional dimension. These are shown in Table 19, below. Teachers that were at the near mastery and mastery level taught both letter names and sounds and consistently used letter sounds throughout their lessons. Student use of phonemic awareness was observed as they participated in word-creating activities, dictation and writing activities, and reading activities.

Teachers demonstrated strong and consistent implementation of practices that helped students develop oral language skills. CETT teachers integrated discussions and activities to develop concepts and vocabulary in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes throughout the reading language arts lesson. For example, teachers would conduct whole class discussions of books or texts read, teach students songs and poems, and form heterogeneous small groups for discussions on a variety of topics. The most common style of discourse was description, but some teachers also taught students to use other discourse styles such as persuasion and compare and contrast.

Teachers that participated in the project were able to identify various approaches to teaching reading and to discuss how their practices benefited students.

Table 19: CETT CA-RD Successful Practices

Dimensions	Program	Initiating	Form w/o Substance	Near Mastery	Mastery
Phonological Awareness	CETT	18.4%	31.6%	50.0%	0
	Non-CETT	27.6%	63.6%	9.1%	0
Oral Language	CETT	2.6%	60.5%	26.3%	10.5%
	Non-CETT	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0
Reflection	CETT	0	63.2%	36.8%	0
	Non-CETT	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0

E. School-level Factors

To obtain school-level data, 65 interviews were held with school principals, 49 in CETT schools and 16 in non-CETT schools.⁴ This section presents findings from these interviews. The presentation of the school-level findings follows the same framework as that used for the teacher data. CETT and non-CETT comparisons are presented first. These are followed by factors contributing to the implementation of successful practices and obstacles to implementation. Few subregional differences were noted, so discussion of any such differences has been incorporated in the relevant sections.

1. Overall Trends CETT versus Non-CETT

Principals were asked questions about their overall priorities for their schools, their literacy goals, their satisfaction with their literacy program, their philosophy of literacy instruction, and their role and supervisory practices in relation to the literacy program. Their responses revealed many similarities between CETT and non-CETT principals; however, differences were noted in several key areas. More CETT principals saw literacy as their highest goal, more mentioned comprehension as a specific literacy goal, and more expressed satisfaction with their literacy programs. Also, 30.1 percent of CETT principals specifically mentioned CETT methodologies as their preferred approach to reading, and were able to describe these methodologies, while many other CETT principals described methodologies compatible with CETT goals. In terms of supervision, CETT and non-CETT principals reported making similar numbers of classroom

⁴ There were 51 CETT schools visited in the study, but two CETT principals were unavailable for interviews. One principal was interviewed twice, since he was principal of both a non-CETT school and a CETT school. Therefore, there are 65 interviews, but only 64 actual individuals.

visits, but CETT principals had more flexible approaches to supervision, stating that they focused more on teachers who needed more help. Furthermore, some dissemination of CETT ideas was noted in favorable comments made by non-CETT principals about the CETT program.

A summary of findings regarding CETT and non-CETT similarities and differences is presented in Table 20.

Table 20: CETT vs. non-CETT: Summary of Principals' Responses

Area Identified	Percentage of responses- CETT	Percentage of responses- Non-CETT
Literacy as highest single priority	24.5%	12.5%
Comprehension stated as key literacy goal	30.6%	18.8%
Satisfaction with literacy program		
-Unqualified yes	32.6%	25.0%
-Yes, but needs improvement	42.9%	37.5%
-Not satisfied	0	25.0%
Favored Literacy Approach		
-Traditional	0	6.3%
-Focus on sound-symbol	2.0%	6.3%
-No one method/Combination	12.2%	25.0%
-CETT methodology	30.1%	6.3%
-Other	44.9%	56.3%
Conception of role in relation to reading program		
-Primarily administrative	34.7%	37.5%
-Primarily pedagogical	65.3%	62.5%
Supervisory System		
-Uses established system	53.1%	81.3%
-Uses flexible system	30.6%	18.7%
Frequency of Visits to Classrooms		
-Less than once weekly	34.7%	37.5%
-Once weekly or more	18.4%	25%
Support from Private Sector	22.4%	31.3%

a. Priorities and Satisfaction with Literacy Program

Twenty-four and a half percent of the CETT principals, as compared with only 12.5 percent of the non-CETT principals, identified literacy as their only priority. Likewise, 30.6 percent of CETT principals mentioned the importance of comprehension and critical thinking as key goals, as compared with 18.8 percent of the non-CETT principals. Other responses were quite varied, many simply stating that their goal was that children read and write well. A few mentioned the need to devote more time to reading. For some the goal was for all students to pass the grade or to pass a certain test, or to read by a certain time in the year. Finally, no CETT principals said they were dissatisfied with their reading program, while 38 percent of non-CETT principals were.

Principals' comments about other priorities were a useful reminder of the overall context in which the schools were set. Poverty and lack of resources were prevailing themes, as principals

mentioned many key underpinnings for successful literacy programs, such as concerns about hungry children, their need for more teachers or regularly contracted teachers, their need for more classrooms and repairs to infrastructure and the difficulty many experienced in involving impoverished and often illiterate parents in their school literacy programs.

b. Preferred Philosophy or Approach to Reading

As indicated in Table 20, 30.1 percent of CETT principals mentioned CETT methodologies as their favored approach to literacy instruction. They often went on to describe this methodology as combining emphases on sound-symbol relationships with comprehension, as well as basing learning on children's own experiences and encouraging more active participation. Some also indicated that teachers must choose what works best for their particular class and for the needs of individual students. One non-CETT principal also said that the best method was that used by the CETT. Many responses did not actually describe an approach to reading, but instead mentioned the importance of other important aspects of successful instruction, such as ensuring student participation, motivating children, and basing lessons on children's experience.

2. Factors Contributing to Implementation of Successful Practices

Principals' responses during their interviews provided both personal reflections on their own experience in the project (such as their comments as to whether their training prepared them to do their jobs more effectively), and their perceptions of the experience of others in their school community. Thus, principals' school-wide overview of their impressions of the teacher's reactions to their training and of changes in teacher practice provided a useful perspective on data received from the teachers. This section will summarize both of these types of data, focusing primarily on factors that contributed to the implementation of successful practices. Principals' comments on their training and perceived changes in their role are presented first, followed by their comments on the teacher training, changes in teaching practice, and statements about student and parent reaction to the CETT.

a. Principals' Training and Changes in Role

Training

Although teacher training is the focus of the study, CETT principals have also received a wide variety of types and frequency of training, with the goal of assisting them to support teachers in implementation of their training. About a third attended special orientation sessions for principals. Some principals attended monthly sessions on topics of general pedagogical interest, while some attended all or part of the teacher training, and some attended both principal and teacher training. Also, 67.4 percent of the CETT principals reported having received other training in the past three years, on a variety of topics. Many of these bore considerable relationship to the CETT training.

Principals were asked to identify the most useful aspects of their CETT training. The most useful areas identified by 37.8 percent of the principals were learning what to expect the teachers to be doing and specifics of how to teach different literacy components, while 26.7 percent of the principals stated that all of the training was useful. Principals who had attended the teachers' training tended to be very pleased that they had learned specifics of what the teachers were

learning, and they also expressed pride at having participated with their teachers as colleagues in the training. Table 21 presents the data on the most useful aspects of principals' training.

Table 21: Principal Identified Most Useful Aspects of Principal Training

Most Useful Aspects	Percentage of Responses
Learning how to teach literacy using specific strategies, including planning	37.8%
All training was useful	26.7%
Style of training (participative, modeling use of strategies)	8.9%
Use of materials, how to link to Ministry standards	2.2%
Change in attitude	2.2%
No Response	22.2%

Changes in Role

Principals identified two major changes they attributed to their participation in the CETT project. First, they reported that they were providing improved, more dynamic supervision and support to teachers, and, secondly, they reported that the improved climate in the school led to their more frequent and more open communication with the teachers about the literacy program. Although many principals mentioned several changes, when only the first answer given is considered, these two items were each mentioned by 32.7 percent of CETT principals. Other changes mentioned were being inspired to learn more, and making administrative arrangements to assist teachers with CETT activities or needed resources. Figure 9 presents illustrative quotes on the two changes mentioned most frequently.

Figure 8: Principals' Comments about Changes in Their Role

Improved supervision and support:

- I mainly evaluate through observations in the classroom. I go to watch a teacher and note her form of teaching, the way that she addresses the students also. I have a new vision of how to do that. Yes, it has changed, since they now talk about what they are doing and what they've done.
- I participate more in pedagogy than I did before by monitoring what the teachers are doing.
- Before, I thought of my role more as administrator, but now I am in the classroom much more than before.

Improved climate:

- They tell me more, confide in me more. I know their work and they understand that I know them better.
- We were all selfish; we used, all of us, to work completely alone. Now we work together, help each other. The interrelationship among teachers is what I consider to be fundamental to early instruction in reading.
- My role has changed in an excellent fashion. I see such positive changes. As a teacher, I would say that the biggest change is in my colleagues; the most positive thing is that they can see the changes. And I think of myself not as their captain, but as their colleague.

Discussion: *The comments on changed supervisory styles are representative of those made by several principals who spoke of a shift from a more administrative style to one with a more pedagogical focus. The development of a learning community and a positive school climate that fosters learning and innovation is essential for lasting teacher change. Few teachers can successfully sustain changes that run counter to school culture. These findings indicate that the CETT is making a positive difference in the overall working climate in many schools.*

Follow-up to principals' training in some countries also included regular meetings of CETT principals. Only 30.6 percent of principals reported attending such meetings; many others stated they would find it useful to have such opportunities to discuss the CETT with other principals.

b. Principals' Views of Teacher Training

Most Successful Aspects

Principals were asked how they thought their teachers felt about their participation in the project. The response was very positive: 92.9 percent of respondents stated that their teachers were happy, motivated, proud, interested in and willing to try new things. Only 7 percent mentioned some negative reactions, saying a few teachers were still resistant to change.

Principals stated that the most useful aspect of the teacher training was the overall approach and methodology, which was mentioned by 18.4 percent, while better reading and achievement of reading objectives were mentioned by 16.4 percent of the principals. Many mentioned specific components of literacy, such as oral expression, phonetic aspects, comprehension and writing; taken together these comprised 22.4 percent of the answers. Improved attitudes and better relationships with children and children's greater participation added up to 20.4 percent of the responses. Table 22 presents these findings.

Table 22: Principal Identified Successful Aspects of Teacher Training

Most Successful Aspects of Training	Percentage of Responses
Overall approach, methodology, strategies	18.4%
Children reading better, objectives achieved	16.4%
Specific Literacy Components	22.4%
-Phonemic awareness and phonics	8.2%
-Comprehension	8.2%
-Writing	4.1%
-Oral expression	2.0%
Changes in teacher-student relationship	20.4%
-Children more participative, group work	12.2%
-Child as protagonist of own learning	6.1%
-Teacher better able to reach slower students	2.0%
Other	14.3%
-Teachers learned a great deal	4.1%
-Teachers work together more	4.1%
-Better planning	2.0%
-Use of materials	2.0%
-Trainers well prepared	2.0%
No Response	8.2%

The Importance of Follow-Up

Principals viewed follow-up by CETT trainers as a very important aspect of the training in producing and sustaining change. The frequency of follow-up visits varied greatly between countries, although 100 percent of principals in the Caribbean reported visits of twice a month or more. Overall, 26.5 percent of CETT principals reported receiving visits that often; many in that group reported visits of from once to several times weekly. Some 14.2 percent reported visits about once per month, and another 28.6 percent reported receiving follow-up visits one to four times a year. Those receiving fewer visits often commented that more visits would be useful.

Principals gave two main reasons for the importance of the follow-up visits. First, they commented that the follow-up was very important in helping to change the attitude of those

teachers initially resistant to change. Secondly, they stated that the follow-up was important for assisting teachers in implementing more difficult strategies, especially through demonstrating these strategies in front of the class, because without such follow-up support teachers were likely to find the strategies too difficult and abandon them. Some stated that it was the follow-up that distinguished the CETT from other, less successful projects.

Changes in Teacher Practice

Principals identified several positive changes in teaching practice as a result of the CETT training and follow-up. These included: teachers successfully applying what they had learned in the training, 24.5 percent; children motivated and participating actively, 22.4 percent; teachers happy, motivated, more dynamic and creative, 20.4 percent; and improvements in the classroom environment, which 8.2 percent of principals commented was more print-rich and displayed more student work.

c. Materials

The CETT materials were clearly an important factor in successful implementation of the project. All principals reported receiving materials from the CETT, and many expressed gratitude for them. These included training materials for teachers and texts and teaching materials for classroom use. Most who were trying to replicate the program were using CETT materials they had received in training.

d. Changes in Students

Although changes in students are the desired outcome of the project, such changes evidently also served as a factor in promoting continued successful implementation. Many principals mentioned that changes observed in students' attitudes and learning were positive motivators for teachers' continued hard work in the project, as well as for their own and parental support of the CETT. Principals reported many changes in their students as a result of the CETT, 24.5 percent saying that students were more enthusiastic about reading, another 24 percent saying that students were participating more, and 22.4 percent mentioning that students were reading and writing better.

e. Involvement with Parents and Communities

CETT schools by definition are in poor, disadvantaged areas, and principals' comments about parental participation reflected this fact. Parental participation was viewed as problematic by 49 percent of the principals, with support compromised by poverty, parents' work schedules, and illiteracy; 32.7 percent of all principals mentioned that significant numbers of their parents were illiterate. On the other hand, 40.8 percent described parent participation in positive terms, saying that those who could help did so. Many mentioned support given by parents in physical ways, such as building furniture, repairing a roof, assisting with food preparation or cleaning in classrooms. Although many reported parents coming to classrooms to assist with special events, none stated that parents came to class specifically to assist children in the instructional program.

Parents are aware of the CETT, and 53.1 percent of the principals described parents' reactions to the CETT as very positive. Several of those commented that there had been difficulty with the parents initially because the methodology was different from what they were accustomed to, but that attitudes had changed during the year. Another 18.4 percent simply stated their parents

knew about the CETT, while 6.1 percent mentioned some continuing problems related to the change in methodology.

Schools in several countries held literacy events as a form of outreach to both parents and communities. Subregional differences were noted with regard to these events: only 20 percent of principals in the Caribbean reported such events and none did so in Central America-Dominican Republic, while 43.5 percent of the Andean principals reported them. In most cases, the CETT trainer participated in organizing the events, which sometimes involved more than one school, such as a trainer's cluster of schools. The events often took the form of pedagogical fairs, in which student work was displayed and students and teachers demonstrated reading strategies or displayed their writing and discussed the writing process.

Another type of event reported was a "reading walk" or parade, in which children marched through town carrying posters about books and literacy and sometimes wearing costumes of book characters. In some of these walks, children interviewed passersby about their attitudes toward literacy and whether they thought reading was important. This kind of event is important for increasing parents' pride in the school and interest in supporting the literacy program, and can be helpful at creating a broader network of support for schools in their communities. Several of the events involved support from the local community, and some received attention from the wider community, including coverage in the local press.

3. Obstacles to the Implementation of Successful Practices

Principals mentioned many obstacles to the implementation of successful practices. This section first presents summaries of specific aspects of principals' training found difficult to implement and requests for further principal training. It then presents data regarding needs for more materials, concerns about parental involvement and other obstacles. The section concludes with suggestions from the principals for improvement of the project.

a. Principals' Requests for Further Training

Some 36.7 percent of the principals stated that they wanted to know more about what the teachers had learned so that they would be better able to help the teachers, 10.2 percent requested training to help them in their role as principals, and others made requests for training in specific areas such as writing or evaluation. Principals' requests for further training tended to vary according to the type of training they had received. In contrast with those who attended teacher training or training designed to help them as instructional leaders, principals who had not had training or attended only brief orientations or monthly talks on general education issues more often said they needed to know more about what the teachers were learning and how to provide effective instructional leadership for their literacy programs.

Some difficulties that principals recounted involved getting the teachers involved and helping to change teacher attitudes, and specific areas such as evaluation and the teaching of writing. Principals also noted that teacher transfers – whether CETT-trained teachers being transferred out, or untrained teachers being transferred in – had been problematic for them. They also mentioned the difficulties presented by sharing space. Since many schools in the region have two or even three sessions per day, with different teachers and even different principals and school names, there is no protection offered for class materials or school libraries, and these must

be locked up in an office or other area. With desirable materials such as CETT workbooks and reading libraries, this made extra work for teachers and principals, and resulted in students not having as much access to the materials provided.

b. Needs for More Materials

Over 41 percent of respondents cited a need for more books for the children to read. Basic school supplies were also mentioned as being scarce. Another 13.9 percent asked for equipment such as computers, overhead projectors or tape recorders, 11.1 percent asked for more texts, 8.3 percent mentioned the need for functional chalkboards, and 5.6 percent mentioned other items, such as the need to receive the CETT supplies again next year. Some principals who were trying to replicate the project in their schools mentioned that they needed more of the CETT materials to use in their in-school training sessions. Some mentioned worries about how they would provide the materials needed for continuing CETT strategies after the finish of the project.

c. Needs for Strategies to Involve Parents

Principals conveyed a somewhat mixed message about relationships with parents. As mentioned in the previous section, 49 percent of principals mentioned obstacles to parent participation such as illiteracy, long hours of employment, broken homes, and parents having to live apart from their children because of employment, or expectations for traditional methods of instruction. Several principals stated that they needed support in strategies for involving more parents in support of their literacy programs.

d. Principals' Suggestions for Improving the Project

Principals were asked to make suggestions for the improvement of the project. The largest group of suggestions made by the principals was in relation to training, with 38.8 percent recommending more training. The continuation of the project received 16.3 percent of the suggestions, while 10.2 percent of principals recommended continued follow-up and an equal number made suggestions about materials. These suggestions are presented in Table 23.

Table 23: Principals' Suggestions for the CETT Project

Suggestions	Percentage of Responses
More Training	38.8%
-More for teachers already trained	14.3%
-Extend to upper grades (Gr. 4 and higher)	10.2%
-Extend to grades 2 and 3	6.1%
-Training for Principals	6.1%
-Training for teachers transferred into CETT grades	2.0%
Continue Project	16.3%
More Follow-up	10.2%
Materials	10.2%
Communication and Working Together – teachers and principals	8.2%
Specific Training Topics	4.1%
-Evaluation	2.0%
-Make compilations of successful lesson plans	2.0%
Other	4.1%
-CETT encourage teachers to stay in grade	2.0%
-Be patient—things take time	2.0%
No Suggestions	4.1%
No Response	4.1%

VI. Conclusions

- ◆ *CETT programs in the Andes, Caribbean, and Central America were all successful in training teachers to improve literacy instruction.* In each subregion, CETT teachers had reached higher levels of professional development on a majority of the dimensions studied than had similar teachers who had not participated in CETT.
- ◆ *One of the most promising findings of the study is that CETT teachers are more reflective about their practice, able to examine their assumptions about what kind of teaching works best.* Teachers who reflect on their practices, self-evaluate, and discuss what and how they are changing, can be proactive in identifying areas for further growth.
- ◆ *The most important aspect of CETT training in facilitating teachers' implementation of training has been learning to teach phonological awareness.* More than a third of the CETT teachers mentioned this dimension as the most significant change made in their teaching and it was among the dimensions on which the greatest percentage of teachers had reached near mastery.
- ◆ *CETT teachers provided more opportunities for their students to practice oral and written expression.* Over 80 percent of CETT teachers implemented such practices.
- ◆ *The majority of CETT teachers used practices that promoted development of comprehension and vocabulary building skills, by encouraging students to make inferences when responding to questions.*
- ◆ *In classrooms with CETT teachers, the observers noted significantly more frequent and adept use of effective instructional skills, in ways that have been seen to improve student outcomes.*
- ◆ *Evaluators cited a need for more training in the area of writing.* Though CETT teachers were rated more highly on this dimension than were non-CETT, few had reached mastery.
- ◆ *In all subregions, few CETT teachers could be said to be at the Mastery level as defined in the study.* The evaluation team saw this as understandable, given the breadth of the training. However, CETT teachers had made genuine progress in both knowledge and application.
- ◆ *Differentiated instruction is another area where additional professional development is needed.* One of the more complex instructional skills to master, this dimension was very infrequently observed during the study.
- ◆ *Evaluators noted a need for increased teacher training in managing classroom behavior, also affecting another dimension—the use of students' time.* As the teachers are learning to employ such an array of new skills, their ability to engage students at all times tends to ebb and flow. Positive difference was seen, however, between CETT and non-CETT teachers.
- ◆ *One year is not sufficient for teachers to master “good practice” in the teaching of this array of reading and other teaching skills.* Despite significant changes in professional development, teachers are not implementing good practice consistently. On 20 of the 21 dimensions, less than 50 percent of CETT teachers reached near mastery or mastery levels of professional development. This is not cause for alarm, but rather a recognition of the breadth and depth of the CETT curriculum and the changes asked of participating teachers.

- ◆ *Teachers need additional training in all areas of professional development, even those where the CETT program has been most successful.* For example, increasing the variety and availability of text in the classroom will address several of these areas. Students need more opportunities to read texts independently to build fluency and practice newly acquired decoding skills, to increase vocabulary and conceptual knowledge, and to develop and practice applying comprehension and questioning strategies. Likewise, greater training in the use of a diagnostic focus in their teaching will help teachers be more adept at using assessment data to inform their instruction, group students, and select appropriate materials for students at different levels. Such changes will lead to students working at the appropriate level and to greater student engagement, thereby contributing to more effective use of instructional time. What is clear from these findings is that training needs to move from focusing simply on instruction by elements to more comprehensive training that cuts across elements.
- ◆ *Among the variables studied, there have been few obstacles to implementing the CETT program throughout the region.* Teachers have reached the same levels of professional development regardless of the size of school, the location of the school, or the type of program being implemented. While teachers and principals did identify a number of impediments to implementing CETT training, such impediments were related to the need for further training in certain elements of instruction.
- ◆ *School level support for the CETT program is high.* Principals were generally favorable to their schools' participation in the CETT program and stated that literacy was a high priority for their schools. However, many felt that their ability to support their teachers' implementation of the program could be improved with more pedagogically directed training for principals. Further, more explicit training in strategies for encouraging parents' participation would enhance the principals' ability to contribute to program sustainability.

VII. Recommendations

Though CETT teachers were clearly more advanced than non-CETT teachers on almost all of the teaching dimensions examined in the study, the fact that few had consistently reached mastery or near-mastery indicated a distinct need for further intervention. *After examining the main findings of the research, the study team's key cross-regional recommendation is that all participating CETT teachers need additional training in most areas of professional development.* Improving the training for future iterations, with an eye toward strengthening certain components, will also have a significant positive impact. But the danger of leaving teachers with this partial development is that they will not be able to sustain the gains or proceed to improve them.

Moreover, drawing on qualitative observations, the study team concluded that *teachers who complete their training at a level of near mastery and mastery are more likely to be willing and able to share that knowledge with another generation of teachers.* Teachers with deeper knowledge, practice and confidence levels are more able to mentor other teachers or take on leadership roles in their schools and teacher development circles. The ability of the CETTs to make long-term, lasting impact would be enhanced by continuing the training of these teachers, to bring them to a higher stage of development. The study findings support deepening the training of teachers already in the program, rather than simply adding more teachers.

Greater training in the use of a diagnostic focus in their teaching will help teachers be more adept at using assessment data to inform their instruction, group students, and select appropriate materials for students at different levels. Such changes will lead to students working at the appropriate level and to greater student engagement, thereby contributing to more effective use of instructional time. *What is clear from these findings is that training needs to move from focusing simply on instruction by elements to more comprehensive training that cuts across elements.* Such training will need to involve highly participatory adult learning that combines theory and practice. Teachers are eager, willing and able to learn more, and as their knowledge increases, the connections between elements will become easier to bridge.

Although implications of the findings are discussed by area, many of the dimensions are interrelated. For example, increasing the variety and availability of text in the classroom will address several of the areas. Students need more opportunities to read texts at their independent level to build fluency and practice newly acquired decoding skills, and at their instructional level to increase vocabulary and conceptual knowledge and to develop and practice applying comprehension and questioning strategies. Likewise, teachers who use a diagnostic focus in their teaching will be more adept at using assessment data to inform their instruction, grouping students, and selecting appropriate materials for students at different levels. Students working at the appropriate level will be more engaged and instructional time can be used more effectively.

Specific recommendations for improving the training in key areas are outlined below.

- ◆ **Basic Reading Skills.** Implementation of phonological awareness activities has been consistent but teachers are not able to accurately assess student progress.
 - Focus additional training on the use of progress monitoring to determine which students need additional instruction in phonological awareness.
 - Train teachers to provide students more opportunities to read independently to apply the decoding (phonics) skills they are learning in a variety of texts, and to provide students multiple opportunities to build fluency.
 - The training program needs also to develop or to provide different levels of texts for different purposes: text at students' independent level for fluency building, text at instructional level to practice decoding, and text to build vocabulary and comprehension.
- ◆ **Understanding Text.** Teachers have begun to teach comprehension and vocabulary and to use questioning to enhance instruction but the majority has not moved to teaching students strategies that they themselves can use while reading to understand new vocabulary.
 - Continue training in these dimensions with a focus on strategy instruction in comprehension, vocabulary development, and questioning.
 - Train teachers how to provide students more opportunities for wide reading to develop and apply vocabulary and reading comprehension independently.
- ◆ **Oral and Written Expression.** Teachers are beginning to provide many different activities to teach students to use oral and written expression for a variety of purposes.

- Focus training on strategies for conducting “read alouds,” the writing process, effective writing practices such as the use of planning sheets and graphic organizers, and oral language activities in a variety of formats and for a variety of functions.
- ◆ **Instructional Practices.** Teachers have enhanced their instructional practice—in particular, the use of explicit language and modeling were implemented consistently. The use of guided practice before moving to independent practice was used less often as were the effective use of corrective feedback and scaffolding.
- Focus on training teachers how to use scaffolding and corrective feedback to implement diagnostic focus more effectively, and to focus on the use and interpretation of progress monitoring and diagnostic measures to inform instruction.
 - Provide further training in differentiating instruction, especially in appropriate remediation activities.
 - Demonstrate best practices in the classrooms during follow-up visits. If trainers can give teachers a solid example of what the use of a skill looks like in practice, the teachers will have more confidence to try it on their own and adapt it to their needs.
- ◆ **Classroom Management.** Teachers have made changes in their behavior management techniques but off-task behavior was observed consistently across sites.
- Provide additional training in the use of various grouping formats and in the use of assessment data to group students for various instructional purposes.
 - The training should also provide effective positive behavior management practices, and a stronger focus on the effective use of time. These dimensions, addressed in conjunction, give teachers ways to establish a format that is conducive to individual student engagement, in ways that tend to reduce disruptive behavior.
- ◆ **Reflective Practices.** Although many teachers are able to articulate an educational philosophy and can identify a variety of teaching approaches, this knowledge is not always translated into practice. This reflects the difficulty of deep change in teacher practice: once understanding the theory, they must have time to test out and adopt the new methodologies for themselves.
- Focus training on deepening teachers’ knowledge of various teaching methodologies and the appropriate use of each.
 - Also provide training in the use of differentiated materials to target student needs.
 - Trainers’ visits to classrooms should include candid feedback on how the teacher’s performance meets the theoretical goals of the methods practiced.
- ◆ **School-level Factors.** Training should be provided to principals that will enable them to strengthen their instructional support strategies.
- Many principals indicated a need to receive more training that would acquaint them with the specifics of the new strategies their teachers are learning so that they can provide more effective instructional support. This will be important for the long-run sustainability of the project.

- Principals also noted many concerns about relationships with parents and parents' ability to assist with the reading program.
- Training for principals should also include strategies for involving parents in the literacy program.

Final Comments

This study found that teachers in the CETT program have been very successful in improving their skills in the teaching of reading and writing and have achieved a higher level of competency on the dimensions studied than teachers from comparison schools who did not participate in the CETT in-service training. Though these results are heartening and promising, the study team also offers in this report a list of recommendations that would strengthen and improve teacher and student outcomes. Using such recommendations would help to ensure that teachers in whom so much has already been invested are trained not only to use these new techniques, but to analyze and weigh the changes in their classrooms, intervene in their own processes more effectively, and spark ongoing professional development through their own ability to mentor others. Enhancing and extending the effects of CETT through these recommendations promises to sustain the capabilities newly produced and invoke a multiplier effect throughout these school systems and countries.

<p>ANNEXES</p> <p>REFLECTIVE STUDY</p> <p>OF TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p>
--

Annex A: Best Practices in the teaching of Early Literacy

Annex B: Glossary of Terms

Annex C: Stages of Development toward Exemplary Literacy Instruction

Annex D: Instruments

ANNEX A

BEST PRACTICES IN THE TEACHING OF EARLY LITERACY

PART ONE: AT THE CLASSROOM LEVEL – TEACHING PRACTICE

I. Reflective Practice (Interviews)

A. Personal Reflection about Teaching Practice

Teacher is reflective about practice, able to articulate philosophy of reading and to explain why he/she chooses different approaches at different times and for different children.

Level 1: Teacher is not reflective, does not question established practice or demonstrate interest in trying new research-based strategies.

Level 2: Teacher questions established practice, is interested in trying new strategies based on current research, but is not comfortable choosing strategies, and prefers to rely on the guidance of others.

Level 3: Teacher demonstrates familiarity with several strategies and approaches, and feels comfortable selecting strategies appropriate for the needs of individual students. Teacher articulates a philosophy, keeps a journal or notes about teaching.

Level 4: Teacher is confident of own abilities, and continually looking for ways to improve. Provides reasons for choosing from a wide variety of strategies and lessons for use with different individuals or groups of children. Articulates philosophy based on current research/training. Keeps a journal, keeps notes, or writes for publication.

B. Work with Others to Improve Practice

Teachers work with each other, discussing lessons, problems, strategies and ways to improve their practice. They may engage in peer observations.

Level 1: Teacher does not discuss teaching issues or problems with others. Teacher may feel that s/he is the only one who has difficulties. Is uncomfortable with trainer or coach in classroom.

Level 2: Teacher is comfortable with coaching help, is willing to discuss problems with others, may seek out advice and attends or expresses interest in attending a teacher study group.

Level 3: Teacher actively seeks opportunities to engage in problem solving sessions with others. Participates in co-teaching situations, study groups, peer observations, action research.

Level 4: Teacher takes initiative in planning meetings with others, requests peer observations.

Participates in and may serve as leader of study group or of action research projects. Teacher at this level may serve as mentor or coach for others.

II. Diagnostic Approach with Ongoing Formative Evaluation (Observations and interviews)

The teacher bases the planning, instruction and instructional groupings on the needs of students. Perception of needs is based on the use of both formal and informal diagnostic assessments, and on informal observation of students, teacher note taking as students read, etc. Students' errors are understood as "windows on their thinking" and are used diagnostically. Teacher is able to place

students on a developmental continuum and identify strengths and difficulties of individual students.

Level 1: Teacher teaches lessons to the entire class based on sequence provided by authorities or textbook. Evaluation is solely for purpose of grading students.

Level 2: Teacher uses or expresses interest in using diagnostic instrument provided by others, and tries to vary assignments for some students based on that data. Groups tend to be fixed.

Level 3: Teacher keeps formal and informal records and planning is shaped by this information. Grouping done for specific instructional purposes. May still feel uncomfortable with the sophisticated ongoing planning required.

Level 4: Teacher planning is based on formal and informal records, and daily observation of students. Student errors are used diagnostically. Grouping is fluid, and teacher may teach “mini-lessons” in small groups as the need arises. States that s/he is comfortable with ongoing planning

III. Use of Features of Effective Instruction

The teacher incorporates features of effective instruction during literacy instruction. To help students build a strong foundation in literacy, teachers introduce concepts systematically and explicitly, building on previously taught concepts. To ensure that students understand the tasks they are asked to complete, the teacher uses explicit language to introduce new concepts, models key skills (such as how to identify a new word, how to identify the main idea, and main aspects of the writing process). To ensure that students practice and learn the new concepts or skills, teachers provide students guided practice in which they have multiple opportunities to practice newly acquired skills in isolation and in context, while providing them positive corrective feedback and scaffolding as needed by students. To help students generalize the use of concepts and skills, teachers provide students independent practice that includes opportunities to practice emerging reading and writing skills independently in accord with their experiences and interests as well as opportunities to talk about what they are learning.

Level 1: Teacher uses a lesson cycle that rarely, if ever, includes explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice. Teacher rarely provides feedback nor does she scaffold student learning.

Level 2: Teacher begins to incorporate in lesson cycle one or two of the following: explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice, but teacher is not yet proficient in their use. Teacher provides non-specific feedback and scaffolding.

Level 3: Teacher uses lesson cycle that regularly incorporates two or four of the following: explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice, using strategies with proficiency. Teacher provides corrective feedback but scaffolding is not always appropriate.

Level 4: Teacher regularly uses a lesson cycle that incorporates explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice. Teacher provides students corrective feedback and scaffolding as needed. Teacher can serve as model for use of these strategies.

IV. Inclusion of Key Components of Literacy Instruction

Reading and language arts instruction includes all the essential elements in an age appropriate manner with age appropriate materials. Teachers demonstrate the use of the diagnostic approach and effective features of instruction (Items II and III above) as they teach this content. Teachers integrate the key elements, often in a thematic approach linking reading and writing to themes in

other subject areas (health, social studies, etc.). Instruction and activities are linked to children's own experience, and take into consideration different linguistic and ethnic backgrounds. Teachers provide systematic provision of key skills, but also take advantage of "teachable moments" to reinforce skills and understandings.

The literacy program includes:

- Oral Language: Students are engaged in oral language activities throughout the day and for different purposes
 - Motivation and understanding of purposes of written language
 - Daily reading aloud to children, by teacher, parents or older students
 - Many daily opportunities for children to look at and read books and other print material at their level and in accord with their experience and interests
- Phonemic awareness activities are provided in a game-like manner, as needed by children:
 - Systematic instruction in phonemic awareness activities initially with a decrease as students become proficient
 - Focus on phonemic awareness skills that have the most impact: initial sounds early on, the blending and segmenting of words at the phoneme level
 - Integration of phonemic awareness skills into other areas such as writing
- Phonics:
 - Systematic instruction in decoding and word recognition skills, linked to meaningful text, based on children's identified needs.
 - Opportunities to practice emerging skills in controlled text and to generalize skills to other text
- Vocabulary and concept development:
Teachers provide activities to increase student vocabulary and concept development
Students are taught strategies for independent vocabulary and concept development
- Support for students who are not fluent in the language of instruction, in all key areas of reading and language arts
- Comprehension
 - Systematic instruction in comprehension, research and study skills in context
 - Instruction in comprehension strategies to use before, during, and after reading text
 - Development of listening comprehension skills
 - Attention to higher-level comprehension skills, problem-solving, question-asking
- Fluency:
 - Use of fluency building activities, such as word banks, repeated readings, etc.
- Writing:
 - Students engaged in writing activities throughout the day, for a variety of purposes
 - Original writing by students on a daily basis, e.g., journals, personal experiences. (Invented spelling allowed in first grade to encourage development of phonemic awareness.)
 - Students receive systematic instruction in the mechanics of writing
- Linkages as appropriate with content areas

Level 1: Skills are taught in isolation and children do not all have opportunities every day to engage in speaking, listening, reading and original writing. Some skills may be emphasized at the expense of others (e.g., an emphasis only on phonics with no attention to meaning or comprehension.). Virtually all questions are at literal level (facts), and require only rote memory. Writing involves mostly copying.

Level 2: Skills are taught in meaningful contexts and children usually have opportunities to speak, listen, read and write every day. Activities are focused on lower levels, although some questions require students to make inferences about information not stated in the text. Written language is only associated with classroom assignments. It is contrived and limited to closed-end responses (including copying and dictation).

Level 3: Oral language, reading and writing are integrated when applicable and transfer of skills to other subject areas may be encouraged through the use of thematic units. Some comprehension activities involve problem solving, inferences and higher level questioning (making inferences, drawing conclusions, solving problems). Children do some original writing, and have opportunities to edit their work. In first grade, invented spelling is allowed for journals and unpublished personal writing.

Level 4: Opportunities for speaking, listening, reading and writing appear to be seamlessly integrated in thematic units. Questions and assignments require students to apply information learned to new situations or different time frames. Students may formulate high-level questions of their own. Although systematic teaching of skills is provided, teacher also takes advantage of teachable moments to reinforce skills needed by students. Students have ample opportunities to engage in informal writing activities, and in all stages of writers workshop. Invented spelling is allowed in first grade, and teachers may “publish” edited children’s books so that they may be included in the classroom library.

V. Effective and Smooth Classroom management⁵ (Mainly observation, perhaps some useful information from interviews)

A. Organizational Patterns

1. Grouping. Students have been taught to work independently, alone, with partners, or in small groups. Instruction varies between whole class, small group work or individual work; teacher may work with one student or small group while others work independently. Groups vary from day to day as teacher assembles those who need to work on a certain task or skill.

Level 1: Teacher uses only one organizational pattern: always whole class or always fixed student groupings.

Level 2: Teacher alternates between whole class and group activities. May take considerable time selecting or forming groups.

Level 3: Grouping varies, and teacher may work with one group while others work independently. Most students know their roles in groups, and most are participating.

⁵ Availability of materials is often not under the control of the teacher or school, and overcrowded classrooms make it difficult to group children or provide interest centers. Even so, it should be useful to note these factors, not only because they’re important for reading success, but because some teachers come up with very creative ways to use local resources and make the best use of limited space.

Level 4: Teacher uses different grouping patterns to maximize student learning;; class flows smoothly from whole class to small group work, with some working independently or in partners, as appropriate to meet instructional objectives.

2. Differentiated Instruction Children work on tasks of differing difficulty, in accordance with their individual needs and abilities. The teacher works separately with some individuals or groups as appropriate.

Level 1: All children are doing the same task at the same time.

Level 2: Children work on different tasks but the tasks may not be targeted to their needs (e.g., the tasks are not at different levels of difficulty).

Level 3: Children work on tasks at differing levels of difficulty that are targeted to their needs.

Level 4: Children work on tasks at differing levels of difficulty that are targeted to their needs. The teacher works separately with some groups or individuals.

B. Use of Resources

Teacher effectively uses a variety of resources of high interest to children. Print material is available at various reading levels. Teacher and student-made materials are designed to meet students' special interests and needs.

Level 1: Teachers use texts in page-by-page fashion, with little variation. Children have few, if any opportunities to use supplementary materials.

Level 2: Most children use the same texts and supplementary materials, although some may use different books and other materials at different levels.

Level 3: Texts and some supplementary materials are used as appropriate to teach needed skills at various student levels and to fit with themes of interest. Teacher provides interest centers to extend instruction.

Level 4: Texts and a variety of supplementary materials are used as appropriate to teach skills in thematic units. These are supplemented with teacher and student-made materials. The teacher provides interest centers to extend instruction.

C. Use of Students' Time

Time is used effectively to maximize learning opportunities: When students first enter or when they finish tasks they have other activities open to them, such as interest centers, books to read, journals to write in, games, etc. Transitions between activities are smooth and take little time.

Level 1: When students arrive in class, or when they have finished an activity, no tasks are provided for them. Some students in groups do nothing while others do the work. Many children in room may be observed doing nothing for 10 to 20 minutes at a time. Transitions between activities may involve considerable time in assembling materials, handing out books, regrouping, etc.

Level 2: Students have standard activities that they may do before school starts or when work is finished, such as reading a book or writing in a journal. Some children in groups are not on task, while others work. Transitions between activities may involve considerable time in assembling materials, handing out books, regrouping, etc.

Level 3: Students have useful individual or small group activities they may do when school begins or when they have finished an activity. Almost all students are involved in

schoolwork during observation. Transitions are efficient; procedures for assembling and distributing materials are evident.

Level 4: Activities are tailored to levels and needs of students, so that use of time is maximized for each individual student. Students may be working individually, in pairs, in groups. All students are involved in schoolwork during observation. Transitions proceed so smoothly they are barely noticed.

D. Organization of Physical Space

The physical space in the classroom is well-organized and attractive, with interest centers, displays of children's work, needed materials available for use, many books and other reading materials available.

Level 1: Classroom is arranged with all desks facing forward. There are few or no displays, no interest centers. Little, if any, children's work is displayed. There may be nothing at all on the walls.

Level 2: Teacher may use flexible seating arrangements. Displays are mostly teacher-made. Displays of children's work are usually "best" papers. Some interest centers may exist but they contain objects for children to look at, rather than activities for children. Some books may be available in a small classroom library.

Level 3: Teacher uses flexible seating arrangements. A variety of children's work is displayed. One or two interest centers provide activities children can use independently, but only some children use them. The room contains a reading center where children may read independently.

Level 4: Teacher uses flexible seating arrangements. Most displays are of current and original children's work, arranged thematically. Invented spelling may be noted. There are several interest centers containing activities related to children's interests or needs. The room contains a reading center where children may read independently.

VI. Positive Classroom Climate (Observation)

The climate is positive, with praise for good performance, and a warm and friendly feeling. Teachers respond in positive ways to student errors. Students are encouraged to assist each other, and they have a voice in classroom decisions.

Level 1: The climate is indifferent or harsh. Teacher may shout at children.. Teacher may laugh at children's mistakes or criticize them in front of others. Children do not have a voice in classroom decisions.

Level 2: Climate is indifferent. Teachers do not shout at children. Treatment of error is inconsistent, sometimes negative. (Teacher says answer is wrong, or moves on to another student if a child doesn't answer.) Children do not have a voice in classroom decisions.

Level 3: Climate is positive. Teachers speak kindly to children. Teachers use positive approaches in treating error (asking for clarification, encouraging student to take time, explaining what question student did answer, etc.) Children have some voice in classroom decisions.

Level 4: Climate is warm and respectful. Teacher interactions with children are positive and nurturing. Teachers use positive approaches in treating error (asking for clarification, encouraging student to take time, explaining what question student did answer, etc.) Children help each other. Because it is safe to make mistakes, they are willing to take chances. At this

level things run so smoothly that it may be difficult to see all of the things the teacher is doing “right”. Children have a voice in classroom decisions.

VII. Effective Classroom Behavior Management

Children participate in formulation of rules for classroom behavior. The rules are stated in positive terms so that students understand the behavior desired. The teacher reminds students of the rules as needed, consistently enforces them, and consequences are understood and are appropriate.

Level 1: Class rules are not made clear by the teacher, nor are they posted. The teacher uses corporal punishment and discipline is rigid.

Level 2: Rules are generally clear but they are enforced inconsistently by the teacher.

Consequences for unacceptable behavior are not appropriate (e.g., writing sentences multiple times, sitting in a corner, cleaning.)

Level 3: Children participate in formulation of classroom rules. Rules and expectations are clear, stated positively and are posted. The teacher enforces the rules consistently. Consequences are appropriate.

Level 4: Children participate in formulation of classroom rules. Rules and expectations are clear, stated positively, and posted. The teacher reminds students of rules as needed. Rules are enforced consistently. Consequences are appropriate.

VIII. Positive Relations with Parents and Community (Interviews)

Parents and/or guardians are encouraged to visit and assist in the classroom. They are knowledgeable about their children’s schoolwork and assist with reading tasks at home.

Level 1: There is little or no parent involvement. Parents do not know what their children are doing and do not feel welcome at school.

Level 2: There are formal teacher-parent contacts. Parents do not visit or assist in class. They do often assist with homework.

Level 3: Parents feel welcome to visit class or to speak with the teacher about their children’s progress. Some may assist with occasional class projects. The class may be involved with community projects.

Level 4: Parents visit school frequently and some regularly help in class by reading to children, assisting at activity centers or helping with crafts. They are aware of their children’s progress and help with assignments at home. Children have projects and interactions involving the community.

PART TWO: AT THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT LEVEL

(NOTE: Levels are provided as an indicator of growth as teachers endeavor to change their teaching practice. No levels are provided for the School-wide and District rubrics.)

I. Role of Principal (Interviews)

The principal is an effective instructional leader, knowledgeable about the reading process. He/she sees the role as provider of support to teachers, as well as a facilitator of interactions between teachers. The principal works with community and with the educational system to procure needed resources for an effective reading program.

II. Role of Trainers (Interviews)

Trainers visit classrooms and are seen as resources and coaches. Teachers seek them out for help and for needed resources. They assist teachers in forming networks or partnerships.

III. Role of Reading Specialists and/or District Support Staff (Interviews)

Reading specialists and supervisors are knowledgeable about the reading/language arts process and are adept both at coaching teachers and at running small workshops as needed for teachers. They assist in communication between schools, may help set up peer observations, etc. Their services are sought after by principals and teachers.

PART THREE: LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN BILINGUAL, MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMS

All of the above items apply to bilingual, multicultural programs. However, additional items should be added, as appropriate to the programs, for specific aspects of bilingual instruction, including the teaching of a second language to the child as specified in the given country and program.

ANNEX B

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Comprehension includes understanding of both oral and written language. Comprehension of oral language is often referred to as listening comprehension. Activities to improve comprehension may also involve understanding of dramas, TV shows, videotapes, etc. Instruction in reading, listening or viewing comprehension means actively teaching students the use of comprehension strategies, not just asking questions.

Examples of comprehension strategies include making and checking on predictions, using graphics, understanding the main idea, summarizing, learning to use the structure of narrative or expository text to aid in understanding, etc

Contrived Opportunities to Engage in Oral Language (Item 2.a.) are not natural conversation or exchange of information or ideas,

Example: teacher gives a pattern sentence such as I like _____ and students repeat the sentence filling in the blank.

Controlled Text (Item 2.d.) is carefully selected to be text the student will be able to decode, and might include familiar words from stories read or other activities, or words from student writing that fit the desired patterns.

Corrective Feedback (Item 1) is immediate and appropriate feedback to incorrect responses, such as questions, prompts, clarification, and encouragement to help students focus on the task.

Example: The teacher asks students to determine if a word begins with a given sound such as /m/. If students answer incorrectly, teacher would provide a prompt. “We are identifying words that begin with /m/. Say /m/.” Then question, “Does pat begin with /m/?”

Feedback, non-specific (Item 1) indicates answer was wrong but does not provide information to help the student improve his or her understanding, deepen his or her thinking or formulate the desired response.

Examples: ‘that’s wrong,’ ‘try again,’ ‘you know that,’ or calling on another child when student fails to answer or provides incorrect response.

Explicit Language, Guided Practice, Independent Practice (Item 1) Teacher uses clear language in appropriate sequence, provides practice with sufficient examples at students’ level, provides time, appropriate examples and guidance during independent practice.

Example: teacher “not proficient” in the use of explicit language, guided practice independent practice—language is not clear or not well sequenced, teacher does not provide enough examples, examples are not directly related to task, sufficient opportunities are not given to practice with guidance from the teacher.

Fluency (Item 2.g) is a combination of reading rate and accuracy when reading text orally. Techniques for improving fluency include providing children with banks of cards to practice reading, games (e.g., bingo) encouraging quick identification of words, repeated readings of the

same text, and activities such as “Reader’s Theater,” in which children are given parts in a story and read it aloud to others.

Instruction refers to actively teaching students a skill or concept.

Invented Spelling is a term used in English to refer to the early stages of writing in which children spell words as they sound. At early stages, children leave out letters and frequently use letter names to represent sounds (ex: hs for house; tabl for table). Research shows that children’s phonemic awareness is developed if they are allowed to use invented spelling in the very early stages of writing, for personal writing such as journals or first drafts. (It is recommended that all writing for “publication” be edited.)

Phoneme is the smallest unit of sound that distinguishes between words in a given language.

Phonemic Awareness (Item 2.c.) is the most complex skill within phonological awareness and includes the combination, manipulation, and segmenting words at the phoneme level.

Example: Activities might include; “Tell the sounds in pat. What words do the following sounds form /p/ /a/ /t/? What word do we get if we take the /p/ off of pat? What word do we get if we add /s/ at the end of pat?”

Phonics (Item 2.d.) is instruction in how sounds in spoken language are represented by letters and spellings. Phonics instruction includes a continuum of skills: letter recognition, alphabetic principle, decoding and blending words, and spelling. Instruction will be in isolation and in context.

Phonological Awareness is the recognition of the sounds of spoken language and how they can be combined, manipulated, and separated. This is different, and separate from, recognition of sound-symbol relationships. In terms of segmenting words, there is a continuum of difficulty in which syllables are easiest followed by onset/rime and finally phonemes.

Onset and Rime are terms used to describe parts of one-syllable words in English.

- **Onset** refers to the initial consonant(s).
- **Rime** is the part of a syllable that includes the vowel and consonant(s) following the initial consonant(s).

Oral Language Activities (Item 2.a.) are activities designed to encourage the child to produce or initiate language.

Contrived or inauthentic oral language opportunities (Item 2.a.) are not natural conversation or exchange of information or ideas. Example: the teacher gives a sentence pattern like “I like _____” and the students repeat the sentence, filling in what is missing.

Rhyme involves matching the ending sounds of words.

Scaffolding (Item 1) means adjusting and extending instruction up or down (teachers’ language, tasks, materials, group size, etc.) so the student is challenged and learns new skills.

Example: When a student first learns a skill, the teacher will provide more examples, more guided practice, may work individually or in small groups with students needing

more help. As the student becomes more proficient, he/she will need less scaffolding and will therefore work more independently.

Vocabulary Development (explicit) is direct instruction on word meanings, practice with use of words in sentences.

Indirect opportunities to develop vocabulary (Item 2.c.) means providing students with experiences that give them opportunities to learn new words and concepts.

Examples: Students learn new vocabulary from wide reading. The more they read, more likely they are to learn new vocabulary. Other ways to develop vocabulary indirectly could include participation in special activities such as field trips or community projects in which new words or concepts are learned, listening to visiting parents tell about their work, listening to and discussing stories told or read, etc.

Writing means the construction of meaning in printed form, rather than work on penmanship, copying single words or filling in blanks with a few letters.

Writing Mechanics refers to grammar (syntax, complete sentences, punctuation) and spelling and is one aspect of writing instruction.

Writing Process includes the following steps: prewriting (generating ideas & organizing ideas), drafting (first pass, focus on content), revising (revising of draft after conference with teacher or peer, focus on content, sentence structure and organization), editing (focus on spelling, capitalization), and final copy.

Writers' Workshop is a process in which students are provided feedback on their writing at each step by either the teacher or peers.

ANNEX C

STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT TOWARD EXEMPLARY LITERACY INSTRUCTION

The goal of the CETT is to help teachers become exemplary literacy teachers. In order to do this, many teachers will be asked to change their behavior. This is not an easy task; teachers teach as they were taught, and changing behavior is difficult, often taking years. The change sought requires far more than providing a few new activities or materials to teachers; rather it may require changes in deep-seated beliefs and long-standing habits. Observers in many school improvement projects around the world have noted that there is a continuum of change that can be noted in teachers trying to change from traditional practices to approaches in which children are active participants in their own learning. Four stages of progress towards exemplary literacy teaching are presented below.⁶

STAGE ONE: No Form and No Substance

- *They almost have the lesson memorized.*
- *I taught it but they didn't learn it. These children just don't know how to learn.⁷*
- *Don't waste your time on him [a first grader]. He doesn't know anything.*
- *It takes me about five weeks to teach reading. [A first grade teacher]*

Teachers in this stage teach as they were taught, generally through rote memorization and group chanting of responses. Taking dictation from teachers or copying off the black/white board may characterize much of the classroom time for both teachers and students. Teaching of reading may be equated with decoding, and in Spanish-speaking countries may take the form of memorization of meaningless syllables (*ma me mi mo mu*). In English-speaking countries children may simply memorize sight words. Whatever the method, teachers use only that method and do not question it. Instruction is whole class, with everyone doing the same thing. Any questions asked of children are at the level of simple facts. Writing is equated with copying, and good penmanship and spelling are more important than content. Evaluation, if any, is for the purpose of giving grades. In fact, a hallmark of this level is the absence of ongoing, formative, evaluation; there is no diversification of instruction for different levels or different needs of children. Teachers at this stage, if asked to change, express a combination of fear and resentment. Some feel they “know” how to teach, while others, interested in the change, fear unfamiliar, time-consuming new methods. Sometimes they fear the reaction by parents to new ways of teaching; community and parent awareness of the reasons for change are particularly important at this stage.

STAGE TWO: Form without Substance

⁶ Adapted from, "Evolution in the Application of Active Learning", in Ammar, Maha; Gilboy, Andrew; Hunt, Barbara; Kraft, Richard; El Said, Maha. 2003. New Schools Program Mid-Term Evaluation. Report prepared for USAID/Egypt under the Global Evaluation and Monitoring Project, Task Order #807.

Aguirre International: Washington, D.C., p. 18-20.

⁷ Quotes marked with an asterisk are actual quotes heard from teachers in the US and Latin America. The others are remarks typical of those heard at the given level.

Now I sit them in groups for their dictation and copying in each subject. I don't know if you know we now have a new educational approach (un enfoque nuevo), now we use large chart paper (papelógrafos).

At this stage many teachers become conversant with the new jargon, and may begin to try some of the new ideas. Teachers learn the basic behaviors of a new form of teaching, but have difficulty going beyond that in which they have been trained. Students may be seated in groups, but they do not do much real group work, and the teacher still dominates the classroom. In literacy, teachers may now try to add new components learned in training, but these are usually taught separately, without integration; teachers do the same activities with little or no variation. Evaluation and assessment are irregular, and often occur only at the end of a term or year. The teacher may give a diagnostic test but simply file the results, and generally does not make a habit of ongoing, informal evaluation. There is still little or no diversification of instruction for different groups or individuals. Teachers at this stage, who are trying to change, need ample support in-class as well as support from their peers, principals and supervisors. Without support, they may simply try the new methods, find them difficult, and abandon them.

STAGE THREE: Improved Form and Substance

My student groups are working on different aspects of an integrated unit on animals.

Teachers at this level have a more sophisticated understanding of children's development towards literacy. All important components of literacy instruction are included, and are usually well integrated, often into thematic units linked with content areas. Teachers begin to create their own learning materials and work with their peers to develop many new approaches to concepts being taught. The teacher regularly assesses the individuals and groups on their progress, and provides instruction on specific needs to students. Student grouping is flexible; some may be working in small groups, in partners or individually. Teachers at this stage are "on their way," and may begin to serve as trainers or mentors for their peers, helping to reinforce change in a school or cluster of schools.

STAGE FOUR: Form and Substance

We as teachers are not satisfied with learning in our classes. My students and I are studying and working towards the elimination of pollution in our community.

Teachers at this stage are never satisfied with learning in their classes, and they work cooperatively with their peers to improve it. Students play an active role in teaching and learning, and literacy is integrated with content to confront "real life" problems. Learning occurs not only in the classroom but also out in the community. This is the ultimate goal of any pre- or in-service teacher-training program and these teachers are characterized as "Reflective Practitioners," who not only know what they are doing and how to do it, but also continuously ask, "Why?" and "How?" they can improve children's learning. They have a deep knowledge of literacy and of how children learn. They are constantly looking for new ways to assist children who are having difficulty mastering concepts. To observe a true master teacher is to see an artist at work; the class is a seamless web in which it hardly appears that the teacher is teaching.

ANNEX D

INSTRUMENTS AND PROTOCOLS

This Annex contains the following instruments and background documents used in the CETT Reflective Study. These instruments have been revised based on the experiences, findings, and lessons learned in the Caribbean CETT Pilot Study.

- 1. Classroom Observation Form**
- 2. Teacher Interview Rating Instrument**
- 3. Classroom Observation Log**
- 4. Language Checklist**
- 5. Interview forms:**
 - CETT Teachers**
 - Non-CETT Teachers**
 - CETT Principals**
 - Non-CETT Principals**
 - CETT Trainers or Reading Specialists**
 - CETT Training Coordinator**
 - CETT Administrators, Coordinators, etc.**

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM
(For CETT and non-CETT teachers)

Country_____ Dept_____ Town_____

School_____ Grade_____ Bilingual Program?_____

CETT: Yes No

Teacher : _____ M___F___ Language of Instruction_____

Observer_____ Date of Observation _____

Length of Observation_____ Number of Students M_____F_____

Instructions

This instrument is designed to rate the quality of reading instruction in primary education classrooms. You will observe individual classrooms and make ratings based on the evidence present. Although the bulk of the ratings will be made based on your observation of a reading lesson, your whole time in the classroom should be included in making judgments. If the data collector does not see the evidence for an item during the observation s/he should make sure in the interview with the teacher following the observation to ask questions to obtain the information about an item.

Each boldface statement on the page is the criterion to be rated. Criteria are followed by descriptions of indicators that must be considered in the rating. Circle the number below the indicators that best characterizes your observation of the class.

Suggestions:

1. Read over the entire observation instrument before beginning to rate the classroom.
2. The items do not have to be completed in order. Some criteria are rated more easily than others and these can be completed first. Start with criteria most easily observed, such as items for Organization of Physical Space.
3. Base your rating on your overall observation of the classroom, and on the interview following the observation.
4. Don't feel pressured to rate a criterion too quickly. Relax, observe, and gain a sense of what is happening. Make your rating on your overall observation of a classroom.

1. FEATURES OF EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Teacher uses a lesson cycle that does not include explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice. Teacher rarely provides feedback nor does he/she scaffold student learning.	Teacher incorporates in lesson cycle one or two of the following: explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice, but teacher is not proficient in their use. Teacher provides non-specific feedback and scaffolding.	Teacher uses lesson cycle that regularly incorporates three or four of the following: explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice, using strategies with proficiency. Teacher provides corrective feedback but scaffolding is not always used appropriately.	Teacher regularly uses a lesson cycle that incorporates explicit language, modeling, guided practice and independent practice, using strategies with proficiency. Teacher provides students corrective feedback and scaffolding as needed. Teacher can serve as model for use of these strategies.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2. COMPONENTS OF LITERACY INSTRUCTION

2.a. Oral Language Development

Teacher does not provide students opportunities to engage in oral language activities that help them develop new vocabulary and interaction patterns.	Teacher provides students opportunities to engage in oral language activities at specific times and they are contrived and limited to closed-ended responses (repetition, one or two word responses).	Teacher provides students opportunities to engage in oral language activities but purposes are limited (e.g., only in conjunction with a story or book).	Teacher provides students multiple opportunities to engage in both open-ended and closed-ended oral language activities that develop vocabulary and conversational formats for different purposes.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2.b. Motivation and Development of Understanding of Written Language

Teacher does not read to students. Use of written language is not modeled for students.	Teacher reads to students, but does not encourage discussion of story, or incorporate questions. Questions asked are usually fact level. Uses of written language are modeled only in connection with class assignments.	Teacher reads to children daily, showing pictures, eliciting predictions, asking open-ended questions. Teacher models some uses of written language (notes, letters, searching for information, etc.)	Teacher reads to students daily, encouraging discussion of pictures, eliciting predictions, encouraging children to develop alternative endings. Teacher models and encourages wide range of uses of written language.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2.c. Phonemic Awareness

Teacher does not provide instruction in phonemic awareness.	Teacher provides instruction in phonemic awareness but focuses on skills that do not impact literacy development such as environmental sounds or rhyming. May confuse phonemic awareness with phonics.	Teacher provides instruction in the skills that have the most impact for the grade level. Teacher provides instruction that is interactive. Teacher integrates instruction to other areas such as writing and reading.	Teacher provides instruction in the skills that have the most impact for the grade level, differentiated according to students' needs. Teacher provides instruction that is interactive and that integrates other areas such as writing and reading.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2.d. Phonics

Teacher provides instruction in decoding and word recognition skills. Teacher does not provide students opportunities to apply skills in text.	Teacher provides instruction in decoding and word identification skills. Teacher provides students opportunities to apply decoding and word identification skills in controlled text.	Teacher provides systematic instruction in decoding and word identification skills that have the most impact for the grade level. Teacher provides students opportunities to apply decoding and word identification skills in controlled text, and provides opportunities to generalize the use of skills in various types of texts.	Teacher provides systematic instruction in decoding and word recognition skills, differentiated according to student needs. Teacher provides students opportunities to apply decoding and word identification skills in controlled text, and to generalize the use of skills in various types of texts and in other subject areas.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2.e. Vocabulary and Concept Development

Teacher does not provide students opportunities to engage in activities that develop vocabulary and concepts.	Teacher provides students opportunities to participate in activities that increase their vocabulary and concept development. Teacher provides instruction only in explicit vocabulary development.	Teacher provides students both explicit and indirect (opportunities to engage in wide reading) opportunities to participate in activities that increase their vocabulary and concept development. Teacher teaches students some strategies for vocabulary development.	Teacher provides both explicit (with multiple exposures) and indirect (opportunities to engage in wide reading) vocabulary development activities. Teacher regularly provides students instruction in the use of strategies for vocabulary development.
1	2	3	4

Comments_____

2.f. Comprehension

Teacher does not provide instruction that develops listening and reading comprehension skills, in relation to stories read or heard.	Teacher provides instruction in the use of oral and/or reading comprehension strategies to use before, during, and after reading text. Teacher focuses on literal and lower level questioning.	Teacher provides: 1) instruction in the use of oral and/or reading comprehension strategies (depending on student level) to use before, during, and after reading text. 2) opportunities to develop higher-level comprehension skills, problem solving, and question-asking that requires analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.	Teacher provides: 1) instruction in the use of oral and/or silent reading comprehension strategies (depending on student level) to use before, during, and after reading text. 2) opportunities to develop higher-level comprehension skills, problem solving, and question-asking. 3) systematic instruction in comprehension, research and study skills in context.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

2.g. Fluency

Teacher does not provide students opportunities to engage in fluency building activities.	Teacher provides students some opportunities to engage in fluency building activities but text is not at appropriate level.	Teacher provides students opportunities to engage in fluency building activities in text at students' independent reading level but students rarely have opportunities to reread text.	Teacher provides students opportunities to engage in fluency building activities in text at students' independent reading level. Fluency activities include modeling, self monitoring and regular opportunities to reread text.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

2.h. Writing

Teacher does not provide students with opportunities to engage in writing activities other than copying or responses of one or two words.	Teacher provides students opportunities to engage in writing activities at specific times but written language is only associated with class assignments. It is contrived and limited to closed- ended responses (including dictation).	Teacher provides: 1) opportunities to engage in writing activities on subjects of interest to them. 2) systematic instruction in the mechanics of writing. 3) opportunities to edit work.	Teacher provides: 1) opportunities to engage in writing activities throughout the day and for different purposes. 2) systematic instruction in the mechanics of writing. 3) opportunities to engage in informal writing activities and all stages of writers' workshop. Writing instruction is integrated into other areas.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

3. QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES

Teacher asks questions that are at literal level (facts), and require only rote memory.	Teacher asks questions that require students to make some inferences about information not stated in the text.	Teacher asks questions that require students to make inferences, draw conclusions, and solve problems.	Teacher asks questions and assigns tasks that require students to apply information learned to new situations or different time frames. Students formulate higher-level questions of their own.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

4. ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS

4.a. Grouping

Teacher uses only one organizational pattern: always whole class or always fixed student groupings.	Teacher alternates between whole class and group activities. Takes considerable time selecting or forming groups. Students seated in groups are not always assigned group work (e.g., at times are actually assigned whole class activities even though seated in groups.)	Grouping varies, and teacher may work with one group while others work independently. Selection and formation of groups is done efficiently.	Teacher uses different grouping patterns to maximize student learning; class flows from whole class to small group work, with some students working independently, or in partners as appropriate to meet instructional objectives.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

4.b. Differentiated Instruction

All children are doing the same task at the same time.	Children work on different tasks but the tasks may not be targeted to their needs (e.g., the tasks are not at different levels).	Children work on tasks at differing levels of difficulty that are targeted to their needs.	Children work on tasks at differing levels of difficulty that are targeted to their needs. Teacher works separately with some groups or individuals.
1	2	3	4

COMMENTS _____

5. USE OF RESOURCES

Teacher uses texts in page-by-page fashion, with little variation. Children have few, if any, opportunities to use supplementary materials.	Most children use the same texts and supplementary materials, although some may use different books and other materials at different levels.	Texts and some supplementary materials are used as appropriate to teach needed skills at various student levels and to fit with themes of interest. Teacher provides interest centers to extend instruction.	Texts and a variety of supplementary materials are used as appropriate to teach skills at various levels in thematic units. These are supplemented with teacher and student-made materials. Teacher provides interest centers to extend instruction.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

6. USE OF STUDENTS' TIME

When students arrive in class, or when they have finished an activity, no tasks are provided for them. Some students in groups are not engaged in the task(s) assigned to them, while others do the work. Transitions between activities may involve considerable time in assembling materials, handing out books, regrouping, etc.	Students have standard activities that they may do before school starts or when work is finished, such as reading a book or writing in a journal. Some children in groups are not engaged in the task(s) assigned to them, while others do the work. Transitions between activities may involve considerable time in assembling materials, handing out books, regrouping, etc.	Students have useful individual or small group activities they may do when school begins or when they have finished an activity. Almost all students are involved in schoolwork during observation. Transitions are efficient; procedures for assembling and distributing materials are evident.	Students are engaged in activities that are tailored to their levels and needs. All students are involved in schoolwork during observation. Transitions proceed so smoothly they are barely noticed.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

7. ORGANIZATION OF PHYSICAL SPACE

Classroom is arranged with all desks facing forward. There are few or no displays, no interest centers. Children's work is not displayed. There may be nothing at all on the walls.	All desks are facing forward or teacher uses flexible seating arrangements. Displays are mostly teacher-made. Displays of children's work are usually "best" papers. Some interest centers may exist but they contain objects for children to look at, rather than activities for children. Some books may be available in a small classroom library.	Teacher uses flexible seating arrangements. A variety of children's work is displayed. One or two interest centers provide activities children can use independently, but only some children use them. The room contains a reading center where children may read independently.	Teacher uses flexible seating arrangements. Most displays are of current and original children's work, arranged thematically. There are several interest centers containing activities related to children's interests or needs. The room contains a reading center where children may read independently.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

8. CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Climate is indifferent or harsh. Typical behaviors observed at this level include shouting at children, laughing at children's mistakes or criticizing them in front of others. Children do not have a voice in classroom decisions.	Climate is indifferent. Teachers do not shout at children. Treatment of error is inconsistent, sometimes negative. (Teacher says answer is wrong, or moves on to another student if a child doesn't answer.) Children do not have a voice in classroom decisions.	Climate is positive. Teachers speak kindly to children. Teachers use positive approaches in treating error (asking for clarification, encouraging student to take time, explaining what question student did answer, etc.) Children have some voice in classroom decisions.	Climate is warm and respectful. Teacher interactions with children are positive and nurturing. Teachers use positive approaches in treating error (asking for clarification, encouraging student to take time, explaining what question student did answer, etc.) Children have a voice in classroom decisions.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

9. CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT

Class rules are not made clear by the teacher nor are they posted. Typical behaviors at this level include corporal punishment. Discipline is either rigid or lacking.	Rules are generally clear but they are enforced inconsistently by the teacher. Consequences for unacceptable behavior are not always appropriate (writing sentences multiple times, standing in corner, etc.)	Rules and expectations are clear, stated positively and are posted. Rules are enforced consistently. Consequences are appropriate.	Rules and expectations are clear, stated positively, and posted. Teacher reminds students of rules as needed. Rules are enforced consistently. Consequences are appropriate.
1	2	3	4

Comments _____

TEACHER INTERVIEW RATING INSTRUMENT (For CETT and non-CETT teachers)

Teacher _____ Observer _____

The following items should be checked after the completion of both the classroom observation and the interview. Information from both observations and interviews should be combined in making judgments on these items.

1. TEACHER IS REFLECTIVE ABOUT PRACTICE

1.A. Personal Reflection about Teaching Practice

Teacher is not reflective, does not question established practice or demonstrate interest in trying new research-based strategies.	Teacher questions established practice, is interested in trying new strategies based on current research, but indicates that s/he is not comfortable choosing strategies, and prefers to rely on the guidance of others.	Teacher demonstrates familiarity with several strategies and approaches (mentions 2 or 3), and feels comfortable selecting strategies appropriate for the needs of individual students. Teacher articulates a philosophy, keeps a journal or notes about teaching.	Teacher is confident of own abilities, and continually looking for ways to improve (e.g. uses researcher as a source for information). Provides reasons for choosing from a wide variety of strategies and lessons for use with different individuals or groups of children. Articulates philosophy based on current research/training. Keeps a journal, keeps notes, or writes for publication.
1	2	3	4

Comment _____

1.B. Work with Others to Improve Practice

Teacher does not discuss teaching issues or problems with others. Teacher expresses feeling that s/he is the only one who has difficulties. Is uncomfortable with trainer or coach in classroom.	Teacher is comfortable with coaching help, is willing to discuss problems with others, attends or is interested in attending a teacher study group.	Teacher actively seeks opportunities to engage in problem solving sessions with others. Participates in co-teaching situations, study groups, peer observations, action research	Teacher takes initiative in planning meetings with others, requests peer observations. Participates in and serves as leader of study group or of action research projects. Serves or expresses interest in serving as mentor or coach for others.
1	2	3	4

Comment _____

2. USE OF DIAGNOSTIC APPROACH WITH ONGOING FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Teacher teaches lessons to the entire class based on sequence provided by authorities or textbook. Evaluation is solely for purpose of grading students.	Teacher uses or expresses interest in using diagnostic instruments provided by others, and tries to vary assignments for some students based on that information. Groups tend to be fixed.	Teacher keeps formal and informal records and planning is shaped by this information. Grouping done for specific instructional purposes. States that (at times) feels uncomfortable with the ongoing planning required.	Teacher planning is based on formal and informal records, and daily observation of students. Student errors are used diagnostically. Grouping is fluid, and teacher may teach “mini-lessons” in small groups as the need arises. States that s/he is comfortable with ongoing planning
1	2	3	4

Comment _____

3. POSITIVE RELATIONS WITH PARENTS AND COMMUNITY

Teacher encourages parents and/or guardians to visit and assist in the classroom, to become knowledgeable about their children’s schoolwork and to assist with reading tasks at home. The teacher reaches out to the community, not only looking for support for classroom activities, but also encouraging children to participate in activities or projects of service to the community.

Teacher makes no effort to involve parents or community members, and considers their involvement undesirable. Teacher reports that parents are not aware of their children’s progress and that they rarely come to school.	Teacher maintains formal contacts with parents, such as official meetings, but does not encourage parents to visit or assist in class. Teacher reports that some parents do assist with homework. Teacher has few contacts with community members.	Teacher has some parents who frequently visit class or come to speak with teacher about their children’s progress. Some parents assist with class projects. The class is involved with community projects or teacher expresses interest in organizing class community projects.	Teacher involves several parents, who visit class or assist regularly in literacy program. Teacher maintains close communication with parents about their children’s progress and parents help with assignments at home. Children have projects and interactions involving the community.
1	2	3	4

Comment _____

CETT CLASSROOM OBSERVATION LOG

Teacher _____ M __ F __ Grade _____ Date _____

School:

CETT / non-CETT

Observer:

Code

NOTES

Flag for Follow-Up

Page ____ of ____

Aguirre International

March 11, 2005

<p style="text-align: center;">LANGUAGE CHECKLIST (For CETT and non-CETT teachers)</p>
--

Teacher _____ **Observer** _____

Please use this as a checklist during or immediately following the classroom observation, commenting on the following only if applicable. This checklist applies only to the cases in which students who speak other dialects or languages other than the language of instruction are present in regular (non-bilingual) classrooms.

Support for Students Who Are Not Fluent in the Language of Instruction.

Teacher is aware of characteristics of the dialect or other language and of key points of confusion, providing systematic support in all key areas of reading and language arts. Possession of the other language is seen as an asset that is accepted and respected, and aspects of it and its associated culture are incorporated in lessons.

In working with students lacking fluency in the language of instruction:

- ___ 1. Teacher regularly reads aloud to students to provide familiarity with the language of instruction.
- ___ 2. Teacher provides direct modeling in the language of instruction.
- ___ 3. Teacher assists children by rephrasing sentences in the language of instruction.
- ___ 4. Teacher provides translations of unfamiliar words.
- ___ 5. Teacher assists student with unfamiliar sounds in phonemic awareness activities.
- ___ 6. Teacher assists student with unfamiliar words and sounds in phonics lessons.
- ___ 7. Teacher provides extra opportunities for direct vocabulary instruction for students.
- ___ 8. Teacher provides extra opportunities for students to develop fluency by providing word banks, word games, and opportunities to practice rereading text.
- ___ 9. Teacher provides direct instruction to assist student in comprehension.
- ___ 10. Teacher assists student with writing, providing direct instruction in points of grammar or spelling that may cause particular confusion.
- ___ 11. Teacher sets up partnerships or small group work in which students fluent in the language of instruction assist those lacking fluency.
- ___ 12. Teacher conveys attitude that the other language or dialect spoken is an asset (example: might teach some words to others in class, integrate activities related to the culture of the students speaking other languages or dialects).

Comments:

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For Teachers in CETT Schools

The following questions should be asked in the interview with a teacher whose reading and language arts lesson has been observed. The interviewer is the person who observed the lesson. The interviewer should start by thanking the teacher for permitting the observation and for giving time for this interview. Explain that we are not evaluating teachers or schools and that observation and interview results are confidential. The purpose of the study is to help improve the project.

If a teacher's earlier remarks have already answered a question, there is no need to ask that question later in the interview. In some instances, alternate wordings are given.

The interviewer will need to select from among these as appropriate, in order to keep the interview a reasonable length.

(If applicable) We know you've just started in the CETT this year, and some of these questions may address areas you haven't worked on yet. Please don't worry about that.

Tell me a little about yourself, such as how long you've been a teacher, how long you've been at this school, what grades you've taught, how many years you've taught in this grade, whether you live in the community, etc.?

Please also tell me a little about the children in your class:

- Where do the children live? How far do they come from home?
- What do most of the parents do?
- What is the home language of students in your class?

Can you please confirm the number of students in your class?

Present today: M_____F_____ Absent today: M_____F_____

Total in register: M_____F_____

1. How would you describe your priorities for your teaching? (If reading/writing not mentioned, probe. What is the place of reading and writing in those priorities?)
2. Based on what you said about reading, I'd like to focus on your reading and language arts program:
 - a. Do you think reading and writing are priorities in this school?
 - b. How would you describe your philosophy of reading instruction? (alternate wording: What do you believe is the best approach for teaching reading and writing?)
 - c. What are your goals for children's reading and writing in your class?

- d. Are you satisfied with your children's progress in reading and writing?
3. Now I'd like to talk with you a bit about the lesson I observed:
 - a. What were the objectives of the lesson?
 - b. How did you feel about the lesson? (Did it go as you intended?)
 - c. How did you select the activities you chose to do today?
 - d. Was this lesson different from your normal language arts period? In what way?
 - e. Are there other activities you often do that I did not see today? (If yes, follow up — Example, if no writing was observed, "Can you tell me about your writing program?")
 - f. Are there any other comments you'd like to make about today's lesson?
4. Tell me about the materials you used in the lesson today.
 - a. Why did you choose them?
 - b. Do you always use them in this way?
 - c. What other materials would be useful in a lesson with this objective?
 - d. Did the materials come from CETT; if not, where?
5. Now let's talk about the CETT training you've received in the past year.
 - a. How much training have you received so far in the CETT program? Number of days, subject matter?
 - b. Please describe that training (check on length, location, contents, face to face or distance, etc.).
 - c. Which aspects of the CETT training have you found most useful? Why?
 - d. Which aspects of the training have been most difficult to implement? Why?
 - e. In what topics would you like to receive more training?
6. Tell me about any follow-up support you have received from CETT staff. Does someone from the CETT visit you regularly to provide assistance? Who? How often?
 - a. (If yes) Are those visits helpful?
 - b. Who do you usually turn to when you need guidance with instructional issues? Why?
 - c. Do you ever meet and discuss your language arts program with other teachers?
 - In this school?
 - In other schools?
 - Have you ever visited another teacher's reading and language arts class or participated in peer observations?
 - Do you have experience with a CETT-established teacher study group (in the Caribbean, a Literacy Faculty)? Please tell me about that.
 - d. Have you used the regional CETT website or any other website to obtain information for your reading and language arts program?
7. Have you made changes in the way in which you teach reading and language arts since you began implementing the CETT program?
 - a. If yes, what are the changes?
 - b. If yes, what factors most influenced you in making these changes?
 - c. If no, why not?
 - d. What factors do you consider when planning instruction?

8. Now in terms of organization:
 - a. Are the children always grouped as I saw them today? (If not) How do you decide how to group children for instruction? How often do you change the groups? (Probe for possible bases of grouping: skill needs, reading levels, diagnostic test info, discipline or personality issues, gender, age, ethnicity).
 - b. (If there are centers containing books, games, activities for children) Could you explain how and when the children use the centers in your room?
 - c. (If there are no centers) Do you have any plans to try to set up learning centers in your classroom? Why or why not?
 - d. (If teacher has not mentioned this in connection with grouping) Are your desks always arranged as they are today? How do you decide how to use the space in your room?
 - e. (Comment on displays) How often do you change the displays? How do you decide what to put on display?
9. Tell me about (other) materials you have received from the CETT project, and how you have used them.
 - a. Professional materials for your own use?
 - b. Professional materials for the school?
 - c. Results of research?
 - d. Books or materials for use by the children (in addition to the ones I saw today)?
 - e. Are there other materials you need or would like to request?
10. How do you deal with classroom discipline?
 - a. What are your expectations for the children's behavior?
 - b. Is there a common system in use in the school?
 - c. Are you satisfied with the children's behavior? In the school? In your classroom?
 - d. What do you consider to be your most effective strategies for discipline? Your most difficult problems?
11. Many teachers worry about what to say to children when they make a mistake. What do you say or do? Why?
12. (If applicable) You mentioned that you have children in your class who do not speak (the language of instruction), or do not speak it well. How do you handle that?
 - a. How do you support the children's learning of (the language of instruction)?
 - b. If they respond to you in their home language, what do you do?
13. Now I'd like to ask some questions about how you keep records about children's learning.
 - a. How do you monitor student progress? (Ask this first and then use the questions below as probes if the teachers do not address all types of assessment.)
 - b. What kinds of informal daily evaluation, aside from tests, do you use to keep track of student learning?
 - c. What kinds of record keeping do you use? (May I see that record?)
 - d. Do you use a diagnostic test to help identify needs of pupils? (If yes) Please tell me about it: how often do you give it, how do you use the results? (If no) Do you feel such a test would be useful? What do you do to identify the needs of children?

- e. What (other) tests are routinely given in this school?
- 14. Have you received any other training in the past three years?
 - a. From whom? (Ministry of education, a project, etc.)
 - b. On what topics?
 - c. Did it bear any relationship to the training you've received from the CETT?
- 15. Tell me about other support you regularly receive:
 - a. Do you receive visits from others (principal, ministry specialists or supervisors, etc.)? (If yes) Do they help you with your reading and language arts program?
 - b. Is advice they provide consistent with what you have learned in CETT training?
- 16. Tell me about the role of the parents in your school and in this classroom:
 - a. Do you think they are aware of the CETT program? If yes, what is their reaction to it?
 - b. How do you maintain contact with them and report to them on their children's progress?
 - c. In your experience, are they aware of their children's progress in reading?
 - d. Do parents help their children learn to read?
 - e. Do you feel that they are supportive of your efforts?
 - f. Do they come to school events? What events, for example?
 - g. Do they visit the classroom? For what purpose?
 - h. Are you satisfied with their role and their participation?
- 17. Have relations with parents and community changed as a result of the CETT project?
 - a. If yes, in what way?
 - b. Have you participated in any literacy promotion events or activities with community members and parents?
- 18. Have you participated in any research (in the Caribbean, an intervention) related to your classroom work?
 - a. CETT-related? (Please describe)
 - b. Other? (Please describe)
- 19. What are your long-term goals for yourself as a teacher of reading/language arts?
 - a. What things do you do or have you planned to help you reach those goals?
 - b. What are the areas in which you feel strongest?
 - c. The areas in which you'd most like more help?
- 20. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about your participation in this project?
- 21. Do you have any other suggestions for improving the project?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For Teachers in non-CETT Schools

The following questions should be asked in the interview with a teacher whose reading and language arts lesson has been observed. The interviewer is the person who observed the lesson. The interviewer should start by thanking the teacher for permitting the observation and for giving time for this interview. Explain that we are not evaluating teachers or schools and that observation and interview results are confidential. The purpose of our visit is to help us better understand reading and language arts instruction in this country.

If a teacher's earlier remarks have already answered a question, there is no need to ask that question later in the interview. In some instances, alternate wordings are given.

The interviewer will need to select from among these as appropriate, in order to keep the interview a reasonable length.

Tell me a little about yourself, such as how long you've been a teacher, how long you've been at this school, what grades you've taught, how many years you've taught in this grade, whether you live in the community, etc.?

Please also tell me a little about the children in your class:

- Where do the children live? How far do they come from home?
- What do most of the parents do?
- What is the home language of students in your class?

Can you please confirm the number of students in your class?

Present today: M_____F_____ Absent today: M_____F_____

Total in register: M_____F_____

1. How would you describe your priorities for your teaching? (If reading/writing not mentioned, probe. What is the place of reading and writing in those priorities?)
2. Based on what you said about reading, I'd like to focus on your reading and language arts program:
 - a. Do you think reading and writing are priorities in this school?
 - b. How would you describe your philosophy of reading instruction? (Alternate wording: What do you believe is the best approach for teaching reading and writing?)
 - c. What are your goals for children's reading and writing in your class?
 - d. Are you satisfied with your students' progress in reading and writing?
3. Now I'd like to talk with you a bit about the lesson I observed:

- a. What were the objectives of the lesson?
 - b. How did you feel about the lesson? (Did it go as you intended?)
 - c. How did you select the activities you chose to do today?
 - d. Was this lesson different from your normal language arts period? In what way?
 - e. Are there other activities you often do that I did not see today? (If yes, follow up—
Example, if no writing was observed, “Can you tell me about your writing program?”)
 - f. Are there any other comments you’d like to make about today’s lesson?
4. Now in terms of organization: Are the children always grouped as I saw them today? (If not) How do you decide how to group children for instruction? How often do you change the groups? (Probe for possible bases of grouping: skill needs, reading levels, diagnostic test info, discipline or personality issues, gender, age, ethnicity).
- a. (If there are centers containing books, games, activities for children) Could you explain how and when the children use the centers in your room?
 - b. (If there are no centers) Do you have any plans to try to set up learning centers in your classroom? Why or why not?
 - c. Are your desks always arranged as they are today? How do you decide how to use the space in your room?
 - d. (Comment on displays) How often do you change the displays? How do you decide what to put on display?
5. Tell me about the materials you used in the lesson today.
- a. Why did you choose them?
 - b. Do you always use them in this way?
 - c. What other materials would be useful in a lesson with this objective?
 - d. Where did these materials come from?
6. Tell me about (other) materials you have available and how you use them.
- a. Professional materials for your own use?
 - b. Professional materials for the school?
 - c. Results of research?
 - d. Books or materials for use by the children (in addition to the ones I saw today)?
 - e. Are there other materials you need or would like to request?
7. How do you deal with classroom discipline?
- a. What are your expectations for the children’s behavior?
 - b. Is there a common system in use in the school?
 - c. Are you satisfied with the children’s behavior? In the school? In your classroom?
 - d. What do you consider to be your most effective strategies for discipline? Your most difficult problems?
8. Many teachers worry about what to say to children when they make a mistake. What do you say or do? Why?
9. (If applicable) You mentioned that you have children in your class who do not speak (the language of instruction), or do not speak it well. How do you handle that?

- a. How do you support the children's learning of (the language of instruction)?
 - b. If they respond to you in their home language, what do you do?
10. Now I'd like to ask some questions about how you keep records about children's learning.
- a. How do you monitor student progress? (Ask this first and then use the others probes if the teachers do not address all types of assessment.)
 - b. What kinds of informal daily evaluation, aside from tests, do you use to keep track of student learning
 - c. What kinds of record keeping do you use? (May I see that record?)
 - d. Do you use a diagnostic test to help identify needs of pupils? (If yes) Please tell me about it: How often do you give it. How do you use the results? (If no) Do you feel such a test would be useful? What do you do to identify the needs of children?
 - e. What (other) tests are routinely given in this school?
11. I'd like to ask you some questions about any recent training you've received
- a. What training have you received in the last three years?
 - b. Was it helpful to you?
 - c. Have you ever participated in distance learning?
 - d. What additional training do you feel would be helpful to you?
12. Tell me something about support you usually receive:
- a. Do you receive regular visits from: principal, ministry specialists or supervisors, etc.? (If yes) Do they help you with your reading and language arts program?
 - b. Do you meet and discuss your problems with other teachers?
 - In this school?
 - In other schools?
 - Have you ever visited another teacher's language arts class, or participated in peer observations?
 - Have you ever participated in a teacher study group or "quality circle"? Please tell me about that.
 - c. Have you ever used a website to obtain information for your reading and language arts program?
13. Have you made any changes in the way you teach reading and language arts in recent years?
- a. If yes, what are the changes?
 - b. If yes, what factors most influenced you in making these changes?
 - c. If no, why not?
 - d. What factors do you consider when planning instruction?
14. Tell me about the role of the parents in your school and in this classroom
- a. How do you maintain contact with them and report to them on their children's progress?
 - b. In your experience, are they aware of their children's progress in reading?
 - c. Do parents help their children learn to read?
 - d. Do you feel that they are supportive of your efforts?
 - e. Do they come to school events? What events, for example?
 - f. Do they visit the classroom? For what purpose?

- g. Are you satisfied with their role and their participation?
15. Do you have contacts with community members other than parents? Please describe.
16. Have you participated in any research related to your classroom work? Please describe it.
17. What are your long-term goals for yourself as a teacher of reading/language arts?
- a. What things do you do or have you planned to help you reach those goals?
 - b. What are the areas in which you feel strongest?
 - c. The areas in which you'd most like more help?
18. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me that I might not have asked?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For Principals in CETT Schools

Please tell me a little about yourself, such as how long you've been a principal, how long you've been at this school, your previous teaching experience, in what grades, where you studied, if you live in the community, etc.

Please tell me a little about your school:

- How many students are there in the school? In what grades?
 - Where do the children live? How far do they come from home?
 - What do most of the parents do?
 - Are there many children of school age who are not enrolled in the school?
 - What are the home languages of students in your school?
 - (Possibly take a tour)
1. How would you describe your priorities for the school? (If reading/writing not mentioned, probe. What is the place of reading and writing in those priorities?)
 2. Based on what you said about reading, I'd like to ask some questions about the reading and language arts program in your school:
 - a. Could you please describe your philosophy or approach to early instruction in reading and language arts?
 - b. How do you view your role in relation to the school's reading program?
 - c. Has that changed since your school's participation in the CETT?
 - d. What are your goals for a child's learning in reading and writing in this school?
 - e. Are you satisfied with your students' progress in reading and writing?
 - f. How do your teachers feel about their participation in the CETT program?
 3. I'd like to ask you some questions about any CETT training you've received:
 - a. Tell me about the training you received in the CETT program (length, location, contents, face to face or distance).
 - b. What aspects of it did you find most helpful?
 - c. What aspects of it did you find most difficult to implement?
 - d. Do you personally receive any ongoing support from CETT personnel? Please describe.
 - e. Have you made changes in your role as a result of the CETT project? Please describe.
 - f. What additional training do you believe would be helpful to you?
 4. Have you received any other training in the past three years?
 - a. From whom?
 - b. On what topics?

- c. Did it bear any relationship to the training you've received from the CETT?

5. Tell me about your perception of the CETT training your teachers have received.
 - a. What changes have you noticed since they received training?
 - b. Which aspects of their training do you think they have been most successful in implementing? Why?
 - c. Which aspects of their training do you think they find most difficult to implement? Why?
 - d. What further training do you think they need?
6. Tell me about follow-up support provided by CETT staff to you or your teachers.
 - a. Do any CETT personnel regularly visit your school? How often? What do they do in the school?
 - b. Has their support been helpful to you? Why or why not?
 - c. Do you believe their support is useful to the teachers?
 - d. Do your teachers work with each other?
 - e. Do they plan together?
 - f. Do they ever visit other teachers' classes?
 - g. Have they participated in teacher study groups?
 - h. Do you have opportunities to meet with other principals to discuss instructional and leadership issues? (CETT-related? Other?)
 - i. Have you used the regional CETT website or any other website to obtain information for your reading and language arts program?
7. Tell me about other support you or your teachers regularly receive:
 - a. Do you and/or your teachers receive visits from ministry specialists or supervisors?
 - b. Is advice they provide consistent with what you have learned in CETT training?
8. Could you please comment on the materials provided by the CETT and how they are used?
 - a. Professional materials for your own use?
 - b. Professional materials for the school?
 - c. Have you been provided with results of relevant research?
 - d. Books or materials for use by the children?
 - e. Are there other materials you need or would like to request?
9. I'd like to ask some questions about how children's learning is evaluated in this school.
 - a. Do you have a diagnostic test or set of tests that are regularly used in your school to assess children's needs in reading instruction? If yes, who administers it? How often? How are the results used? If no, do you think such a measure would be useful?
 - b. What other tests are routinely administered in this school?
 - c. What other methods of formal or informal evaluation are regularly used by teachers in your school?
 - d. What record keeping do they typically keep of student performance?
10. Can you explain your system for supervising and evaluating teachers?
 - a. Has this system changed since your school entered the CETT program?
 - b. How often are you able to visit classes?
 - c. How do you try to help the CETT teachers?

- d. Has your relationship with the teachers changed since you entered the CETT program?
11. Tell me how your students have reacted to the CETT program.
12. Tell me about your relationships with parents and community members:
- a. Are your parents supportive of your reading and language arts program?
 - b. Do you think they are aware of the CETT program? If yes, what is their reaction to it?
 - c. Do parents help their children learn to read?
 - d. What percentage of parents usually attends school events?
 - e. Do some parents come in and help in classrooms?
 - f. Do you receive any support from local community leaders (money, materials, volunteer hours, publicity, etc.)?
 - g. Have you had special events related to reading and language arts?
 - h. Do parents or community members use your school for other purposes? What?
13. We'd like to know what kind of help the school receives from the private sector in your community.
- a. Are there donations from local businesses to support the school or district? ("Donations" means something in monetary form, or in other forms like materials, volunteer hours, publicity, etc.)
 - b. Who solicits donations from the private sector? What would you need to be able to solicit donations in your community?
 - c. Do you believe that the private sector would be interested in supporting the school?
 - d. If there is private sector participation or support in your school, has it come about because of the existence of the CETT program, or is it something that the private sector has provided independently of the arrival of the program? What arrangements must be done to receive and spend donations? Must the district or Ministry of Education become involved, or can they be received directly here?
14. Do you have suggestions for improving this project?
15. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me, that I might not have asked?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For Principals in non-CETT Schools

Please tell me a little about yourself, such as how long you've been a principal, how long you've been at this school, your previous teaching experience, in what grades, where you studied, if you live in the community, etc.

Please tell me a little about your school:

- How many students are there in the school? In what grades?
 - Where do the children live? How far do they come from home?
 - What do most of the parents do?
 - Are there many children of school age who are not enrolled in the school?
 - What are the home languages of students in your school?
 - (Possibly take a tour)
1. How would you describe your priorities for your school? (If reading/writing not mentioned, probe - What is the place of reading and writing in those priorities?)
 2. Based on what you said about reading, I'd like to ask some questions about the reading and language arts program in your school:
 - a. Could you please describe your philosophy or approach to early instruction in reading and writing?
 - b. How do you view your role in relation to the school's reading program?
 - c. What are your goals for children's reading and writing in this school?
 - d. Are you satisfied with your students' progress in reading and writing?
 - e. Tell me about ways in which you try to help them with instruction in reading and writing.
 3. I'd like to ask you some questions about the training you may have received:
 - a. What training have you received in the last three years?
 - b. Was it useful?
 - c. Have you ever participated in distance learning?
 - d. What additional training do you believe would be helpful to you?
 4. Tell me about any training your teachers have received in the last three years:
 - a. What changes have you noticed since they received training?
 - b. Which aspects of their training do you think they have been most successful in implementing? Why?
 - c. Which aspects of their training do you think they find most difficult to implement? Why?

- d. Have any of your teachers participated in distance learning?
 - e. What further training do you think they need?
5. Tell me about follow-up support provided to you or your teachers.
- a. Do any ministry personnel regularly visit your school? How often? What do they do in the school?
 - b. Do you believe their support is useful to you? To the teachers?
 - c. What other support would you like your teachers to receive?
 - d. Do your teachers work with each other?
 - Do they plan together?
 - Do they ever visit other teachers' classes?
 - Have they participated in teacher study groups?
 - e. Do you have opportunities to meet with other principals to discuss your problems? (CETT-related? Other?)
 - f. Have you ever used a website to obtain information for your reading and language arts program?
6. Could you please comment on the materials you have available in your school?
- a. Professional materials for your own use?
 - b. Professional materials for the school?
 - c. Books or materials for use by the children?
 - d. Are there other materials you need or would like to request?
7. I'd like to ask some questions about how children's learning is evaluated in this school.
- a. Do you have a diagnostic test or set of tests that are regularly used in your school to assess children's needs in reading instruction? (If yes) Who administers it? How often? How are the results used? (If no) Do you think such a measure would be useful?
 - b. What other tests are routinely administered in your school?
 - c. What other methods of formal or informal evaluation are regularly used by teachers in your school?
 - d. What record keeping do they typically keep of student performance?
8. Can you explain your system for supervising and evaluating teachers?
- a. How often are you able to visit classes?
 - b. How do you try to help your teachers?
9. Tell me about your relationships with parents and community members:
- a. Are your parents supportive of your reading program?
 - b. Do parents help their children learn to read?
 - c. What percentage of parents usually attends school events?
 - d. Do some parents come in and help in classrooms?
 - e. Do you receive any support from local community leaders (money, materials, volunteers hours, publicity, etc.)?
 - f. Have you had special events related to reading or language arts?
 - g. Do parents or community members use your school for other purposes? What?

10. We'd like to know what kind of help the school receives from the private sector in your community.
- a. Are there donations from local businesses to support the school or district? ("Donations" means something in monetary form, or in other forms like materials, volunteer hours, publicity, etc.)
 - b. Who solicits donations from the private sector? What would you need to be able to solicit donations in your community?
 - c. Do you believe that the private sector would be interested in supporting the school?
 - d. What arrangements must be done to receive and spend donations? Must the district or Ministry of Education become involved, or can they be received directly here?
11. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me, that I might not have asked?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For CETT Trainers or Reading Specialists
(For personnel who provide direct training and/or follow-up in classrooms)

1. Could you please describe your role and your duties?
2. What experiences in your background do you feel have helped prepare you for this role?
3. Can you explain a little about the strategies you use with the teachers?
4. Do you use the same strategy with all of them?
5. What we saw was... Is this typical? What else would we see in other classrooms?
6. (Optional) Can you comment on the way you have dealt with the following topics?
 1. Elements of Effective Instruction
 2. Components of Literacy Instruction
 - 2a. Development of oral language
 - 2b. Motivation and understanding of the purposes of written language
 - 2c. Phonemic awareness
 - 2d. Phonics
 - 2e. Vocabulary and concept development
 - 2f. Comprehension
 - 2g. Fluency
 - 2h. Writing
 3. Questioning Techniques
 4. Organizational Strategies
 - 4a. Grouping
 - 4b. Differentiated instruction
 5. Use of Resources
 6. Use of Students' Time
 7. Organization of Physical Space
 8. Classroom Climate
 9. Classroom Behavior Management
 10. Teacher is Reflective about Practice
 - 10a. Personal reflection about the practice of teaching
 - 10b. Work with others to improve practice
 11. Use of Diagnostic Approach with Ongoing Formative Evaluation
 12. Positive Relations with Parents and Community
7. What are the factors that contribute to the implementation of the new practices?
8. What are the factors that make implementation of the new practices more difficult?
9. What suggestions do you have to improve the CETT program?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For CETT Training Coordinator

1. Can you please describe your role and your duties?
2. How would you describe the literacy instruction philosophy in this CETT?
3. Please describe the training model you use.
4. What topics are covered in the training?
5. What are the goals of the training?
6. Which goals have been met?
7. In your opinion, what factors contribute to the implementation of the program?
8. What have been the obstacles?

AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
Reflective Study of CETT Programs
Interview Questions:
For CETT Administrators, Coordinators

1. Could you please describe your role and your duties?
2. How would you describe the overall philosophy of literacy instruction in this CETT?
3. Please comment on the CETT training that has been provided in this country. (Ask for information and items not previously received, such as schedules, syllabi, materials).
 - a. What aspects of the training do you think have been most useful to teachers?
 - b. What aspects of the training have teachers found most difficult to carry out? Why?
 - c. Please describe the provisions for follow-up.
 - d. Have your own program evaluations to date caused you to make any changes in the program?
 - e. Do you have plans for changes in the future?
4. What provisions have you made for evaluating the work of trainers and/or persons providing follow-up in classrooms?
5. Please describe the materials provided to participants (trainers, principals, teachers, children's books):
 - a. Have the teachers received a diagnostic instrument for their own use in classrooms?
 - b. (If yes: Is it generally in use?) (If no) Do you have plans to provide such an instrument?
 - c. Do you have plans to change or improve materials, or to provide additional materials?
 - d. Do you have suggestions for improving this component of the CETT?
6. Please comment on relationships between the CETT and:
 - a. Ministry officials at various levels
 - b. Community members and parents
 - c. Private sector
7. Please tell me about provisions you are making for the use of technology.
 - a. Do you presently have any distance education programs?
 - b. Do you plan to develop such programs in the future?
 - c. Does this CETT have a website? (If no, what plans are in place for developing it?) (If yes, please comment on its use by staff, trainers, teachers.)
8. What suggestions do you have for improving the CETT program, either in your country, your region, or overall?
9. Are there other things you'd like to mention that I might not have asked you?